DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 815 PS 004 676

AUTHOR Spaulding, Robert L.
TITLE Educational Intervention in Early Childhood: Appendixes. Final Report, Volume II.
INSTITUTION Duke Univ., Durham, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, Mo.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 122p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS Early Childhood, *Educational Programs, *Family Characteristics, Health Conditions, *Information Dissemination, Instructional Materials, *Intervention, Measurement Techniques, *Program Evaluation, Publications
IDENTIFIERS Educational Testing Service

ABSTRACT

This volume is the second of three which report the results of the five-year Education Improvement Program (EIP) in Durham, North Carolina. Volume II contains appendixes to the first volume. Appendixes include information on EIP publications, dissemination activities, instructional resources made available to EIP teachers, evaluations by outside agents including the Educational Testing Service, health conditions of project children and families, and instruments used in data collection. The three volumes together represent the final report presented to the Ford Foundation. Followup studies using the data gathered during the five-year span of the program will be conducted during the next few years and reported in the appropriate professional journals. Volume I appears as PS 004 675, and Volume III is PS 004 677. (AJ)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED050815

Final Report

Volume II

Educational Intervention in Early Childhood

APPENDIXES

Edited by

Robert L. Spaulding

Director

Education Improvement Program

Duke University

PS 004676

The Durham Education Improvement Program was a project of the Ford Foundation under the auspices of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools whose Education Improvement Project is funded by the Ford and Danforth Foundations. It was jointly administered by Duke University, North Carolina Central University, Durham City Schools, Durham County Schools and Operation Breakthrough, Inc.

The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Ford Foundation, and no official endorsement by the Ford Foundation should be inferred.

Do not quote or refer to this document without written permission. All rights are reserved.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Robert L. Spaulding

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

THE DURHAM EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

A Project of the Ford Foundation

Under the auspices of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools whose Education Improvement Project is funded by the Ford and Danforth Foundations.

JOINTLY ADMINISTERED BY:

Duke University, North Carolina Central University, Durham City Schools, Durham County Schools, and Operation Breakthrough, Inc.

COORDINATING COMMITTEE MEMBERS, 1965-1970

Everett H. Hopkins, Chairman; Vice President, Duke University, 1965-present
Charles H. Chewning, Sr., Superintendent, Durham County Schools, 1965-present
Lew W. Hannen, Superintendent, Durham City Schools, 1965-present
Roland H. Nelson, Jr., Chairman, Department of Education, Duke University, 1965-1967
William H. Cartwright, Chairman, Department of Education, Duke University, 1967-1970
Robert Foust, Executive Director, Operation Breakthrough, Inc., 1965-1966
William R. Pursell, Executive Director, Operation Breakthrough, Inc., 1966-1967
Gerald Underwood, Executive Director, Operation Breakthrough, Inc., 1967-1969
John Croslan, Executive Director, Operation Breakthrough, Inc., 1969-present
F. G. Shipman, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, 1965-1969
Norman Johnson, Chairman, Department of Education, North Carolina Central University, 1969-present
Robert L. Spaulding, Executive Secretary; Associate Professor of Education, Duke University, 1965-1970

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEMBERS, 1965-1970

Robert L. Spaulding, Director
Donald J. Stedman, Research and Evaluation Director, 1965-1968
Nicholas J. Anastasiow, Program Director, 1966-1968
K. Z. Chavis, Program Associate, 1967-1968
Loretta Golden, Assistant Director for Curriculum, 1968-1970
James J. Gallagher, Special Studies Consultant, 1966-1967
Else W. Hjertholm, Coordinator of Preschools, 1967-1969
Rosemary F. Funderburg, Director, School Social Services, 1965-1966
Frederica E. Harrison, Director, School Social Services, 1966-1970
Joan D. First, Director, Information, 1965-1968
Myra B. Rainey, Coordinator of Information Services, 1968-1970
Howard N. Lee, Director, EIP-Youth, 1966-1968
Frank G. Burnett, Principal, W. G. Pearson School
Mrs. Frances Clemons, Principal, Lakeview School
Howard C. McAllister, Principal, Whitted Junior High School
G. B. Summers, Principal, Holton Junior High School
William M. Woody, Principal, Edgemont School
James Weldon, Principal, Southside School, 1965-1967
Clyde P. Richman, Principal, E. K. Powe School, 1967-1968
Willis G. Whichard, Principal, E. K. Powe School, 1968-present

ADMINISTRATION

Mary C. Fendt, Assistant Director for Administration
Dolores W. Clement, Administrative Secretary

3/4

Volume II

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix A. Summary of EIP Information Office Publications, Newspaper Articles, and Other Public Reports (1964-1970).

Appendix B. Resources Available to EIP Personnel in the Instructional Materials Center.

Appendix C. A Report on the Impact of the Durham Education Improvement Program, Submitted by the Educational Testing Service.

Appendix D. A Report of a Site Visit to the Durham EIP.

Appendix E. List of EIP Consultants (1965-1970).

Appendix F. Health Conditions and Services in EIP.

Appendix G. EIP Survey and Family Interview Schedules.

Appendix H. Levels of Social Functioning.

Appendix A

Summary of EIP Information Office Publications,
Newspaper Articles, and Other Public Reports (1964-1970)

PS004676

Appendix A

Summary of EIP Information Office Publications,
Newspaper Articles, and Other Public Reports (1964-1970)

Information Office Publications (listed chronologically)

"Who Is Poverty's Child?" - 1965.

"Fact Sheet for EIP Families" - 1966.

"Pearson." For EIP Parents, January 31, 1966.

"The Education Improvement Program. A Project of the Ford Foundation." February 1966.

The EIPcress File. Volume I, Nos. 1-10 (March 1966 - Christmas 1966). Volume II, (April 1967 - September 1968).

EIP Calendar. June 1966 - June 1968.

"This 'N' That." For EIP Parents, August 1966.

"Lakeview." For EIP Parents, November 14, 1966, I (2).

"Edgemont & Pearson." For EIP Parents, December 22, 1966, I (3).

"Did You Know . . .?" 1967. (United Forces for Education fact sheet)

The House at Lakeview. 1967.

"Sometimes Everything Goes Well . . ." February 1967.

"Holton & Whitted." For EIP Parents, February 7, 1967, I (5).

"The Durham County Schools." Spring 1967.

"Graduate Programs. Department of Education, Duke University." Spring 1967.

"EIP-Y Speaks." March 1967, I (5).

"Lakeview." For EIP Parents, March 10, 1967, I (6).

"Pearson." For EIP Parents, March 24, 1967, I (7).

"Edgemont." For EIP Parents, April 11, 1967, I (8).

"Southside." For EIP Parents, April 12, 1967, I (9).

Educators in Action. Volume I, Nos. 1-3 (April 1967 - June 1967). Volume II, Nos. 1-7 (September 1967 - June 1968).

For EIP Parents. Summer 1968.

"Meet Your Child's Teacher." Edgemont. For EIP Parents, December 1968.

"Meet Your Child's Teacher." Lakeview. For EIP Parents, December 1968.

"Meet Your Child's Teacher." Pearson. For EIP Parents, December 1968.

"Meet Your Child's Teacher." Southside. For EIP Parents, December 1968.

Pulling Up Parents. 1968.

"A Cooperative Project for Pregnant School Girls." 1968.

"A Cooperative Project for Pregnant School Girls." 1969.

Miscellaneous Articles about EIP (listed chronologically)

Macduff, Allen. "Everett H. Hopkins to Head N. C. Fund Project in Durham." Durham Morning Herald, May 6, 1964. (Re: Hopkins's appointment as chairman of Operation Breakthrough)

Morgan, Wilson. "Expanding of Durham's Fund Project Studied." The Durham Sun, May 8, 1964. (Re: Expansion of Operation Breakthrough)

Kirkland, Bill. "Durham Seeking Sanction to Establish New Center for Deprived Young People." Durham Morning Herald, June 19, 1964. (Re: Durham's efforts to be included as one of the cities having an EIP)

"Private Funds Sought in Poverty Fight Here." Durham Morning Herald, January 5, 1965. (Re: "OBT will ask a private foundation to finance an experimental 5-year program here in the education of disadvantaged children . . .")

Samsot, Bob. "City, County Schools Seek Ford Grant of $3.5 million." Durham Morning Herald (Section A, pp. 1-2), January 7, 1965.

"Ford Funds to Aid Poor in Schools." New York Times, April 13, 1965.

"$2.9 million Ford Aid to Boost Schools Here." Durham Morning Herald (Section A, pp. 1-2), April 13, 1965.

Hopkins, Everett H. "People, Poverty and Plenty." Speech to United Church Women in Rocky Mount on their May Fellowship Day. May 7, 1965. (In speech he mentions Ford grant for EIP and the broad, overall goals of EIP)

"Project Slated for 2-year-olds." Durham Morning Herald, October 19, 1965.

"Child Program Director Named." The Durham Sun, November 16, 1965. (Re: Dr. Spaulding's appointment)

"Spaulding to Head Education Program." Durham Morning Herald, November 17, 1965.

"Dinner Honors Officials, Teachers." The Durham Sun, November 17, 1965. (Re: Dr. Stedman's speech to the annual Teacher Recognition Dinner sponsored by the Board of Directors of the Durham County Association for Retarded Children)

"Children Reap Fruits in Education Project Backed by Foundation." Durham Morning Herald (Section A, p. 5), November 28, 1965.

Lindsey, Alberta. "End of Punishment for Pupils Advocated." Richmond News Leader, December 3, 1965. (Re: Dr. Spaulding's participation in Southern Region Conference on Education, John Marshall Hotel, Richmond, Virginia)

"Durham Seeks 2 Million School Study." The Durham Sun, December 14, 1965. (Re: Proposal from Durham City Schools and UNC School of Education to extablish an educational research project on the teaching of deprived children. Project to be in Whitted Junior High and to be entirely distinct from EIP)

"Nursery to be Pioneer Unit." The Durham Sun, March 8, 1966. (Re: Pearson Nursery)

"Poverty Project Progress Report Scheduled Today." Durham Morning Herald, April 1, 1966.

Miscellaneous Articles about EIP (continued)

Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans Symposium. "Education Improvement Programs for Culturally Disadvantaged." April 1, 1966, Jung Hotel. (News Release) EIP staff made the following presentations:
"Introduction and Briefing on EIP-Durham - Stedman
"Infant Research and Evaluation" - Stedman
"Varieties of Educational Experience" - Borstelmann
"Application of Behavior Modification Theory to Educational Programs for the Disadvantaged" - Spaulding
"New Concepts for Evaluation of Experimental and Intervention Programs" - Gallagher

Dr. Stedman Attends Meeting of the American Association of Psychiatric Clinics for Children in San Francisco, April 13-14, 1966. (News Release) Title of presentation - "The Child Psychiatric Clinic and the Mentally Retarded Child."

"Medical Wives Group Hears Dr. Spaulding." Durham Morning Herald, April 13, 1966.

Erwin, Kate. "Children Study, are Studied in Kindergarten." Raleigh News and Observer, June 12, 1966.

Bishop, Owen. "Boy, 3, Whiz at Reading: Tackles 7th Grade Books." The Durham Sun, June 14, 1966. (Re: Dr. Spaulding's comments about the child)

"Lake Michie Day Camp Attracts 30." The Durham Sun, June 21, 1966.

"Lee to Head Teen Education Unit." The Durham Sun, July 16, 1966.

"Chapel Hillian Will Head New Program." Chapel Hill Weekly, July 17, 1966. (Re: Howard Lee's appointment as EIP-Y Director)

Currie, Carole. "Baby's Cooing is Guide to His Future Learning." Durham Morning Herald (Section B, p. 1), August 7, 1966.

"Educational Researcher Says Schools Must Make Changes to Meet Needs of the Future." Durham Morning Herald, August 28, 1966.

"System of Grading in Schools Hit." The Durham Sun, August 29, 1966.

"Second Project Year Set in Education Improvement." Durham Morning Herald, September 7, 1966.

Educational Program Administrators Named." Durham Morning Herald, September 16, 1966.

Dr. Spaulding Attends Third International Curriculum Conference in Oxford, England, September 17-22, 1967, as co-chairman of the Compensatory Education Seminar. (News Release)

"Durham Education Improvement Unit Gets New Director." Durham Morning Herald, October 7, 1966. (Re: Mrs. Harrison's appointment as Head Social Worker)

"Dr. Stedman Will Speak." The Durham Sun, October 22, 1966.

"Stedman Addresses PTA." Durham Morning Herald (Section B, p. 4), October 27, 1966.

Currie, Carole. "First Grade Success Is Goal." Durham Morning Herald, November 8, 1966.

Miscellaneous Articles about EIP (continued)

Jackson, Bob. "Stedman Wins Jaycee Service Award." Durham Morning Herald, January 11, 1967.

"Dr. Stedman Receives 'Man of Year' Award." The Durham Sun, January 11, 1967.

Johnson, George. "City Schools Going Ahead on Program." The Durham Sun, February 7, 1967. (Re: Food Service Program)

Jolley, Roger. "Ford Foundation to Aid County's Vocational Program." Durham Morning Herald, February 7, 1967.

Conference on Superior Students, February 23-24, 1967, Quail Roost Conference Center. Jointly sponsored by EIP and the Section for the Education of Exceptionally Talented Children of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction. (News Release)

"Durham EIP to Have Four at Meeting." The Durham Sun, March 1967.

Cooper, David. A candy-handy approach to faster learning. Southern Education Report, 1967, 3 (1), 2-5.

Jolley, Roger. "City School Board 'Favors' Selling Southside Unit to EIP." Durham Morning Herald, April 11, 1967.

Jolley, Roger. "City to Operate Southside Again." Durham Morning Herald, April 14, 1967.

"Project Seeks to Answer Old Questions." Durham Morning Herald, May 17, 1967.

"Southside School Leased by Board." Durham Morning Herald, Summer 1967.

McGill, Ralph. "How Early Does Poverty Affect Children?" Evening Star, Washington, D. C. (Section A, p. 11) August 8, 1967.

Martin, Ed. "Lower Cost Eyed on New Training." Durham Morning Herald, August 1967. (Re: Training proposal for junior high students submitted by Durham City Schools for consideration under Title III of ESEA. Classes would be at Holton and Carr and would cover such areas as carpentry, drafting, electronics, cosmetology, etc.)

Walls, Dwayne. "Two-year old is Pure Gold to Educators, Researchers." Raleigh News and Observer (Section A, p. 2), October 1967.

Walls, Dwayne. "Most 'Retarded' Children Aren't." Raleigh News and Observer, (Section A, pp. 1-2), October 1967.

Kruger, Ann. "Durham's EIP Approach Keyed to Stimulate Child." The Durham Sun, (Section B, p. 1), October 2, 1967.

Kruger, Ann. "Disadvantaged Youngsters Often Bypass A Challenge." The Durham Sun, October 3, 1967.

McGill, Ralph. "Classroom Revolution." (Newspaper unknown), October 5, 1967. (Re: Infant Evaluation Project)

Kruger, Ann. "EIP Broadens Program." The Durham Sun, October 5, 1967.

Kruger, Ann. "EIP Research Data Also to be Useful in Future." The Durham Sun, October 6, 1967.

Miscellaneous Articles about EIP (continued)

Seaver, Don. "Idea That IQ Fixed at Birth Claimed False." Durham Morning Herald (Section A), October 22, 1967.

McGill, Ralph. "'Local Control' Requires Modern School Leadership." Palo Alto Times, October 23, 1967.

McGill, Ralph. "Federal 'Interference" A Must for Schools." The Tacoma News Tribune, October 23, 1967. (EIP's work with children from deprived environments mentioned briefly - article suggests that school systems "with adequate finances and the necessary wish to break with the past in the problem of teaching children out of environments of deprivation" write EIP for latest studies)

"Assistant Director." Durham Morning Herald, November 1, 1967. (Re: K. Z. Chavis' joining EIP)

"School Workshop Damaged by Fire." Durham Morning Herald, November 28, 1967. (Re: Fire at Lakeview School)

"Importance of Environment." The Macon News (p. 4) January 6, 1968.

"Educators Tell of Innovations." The Durham Sun, January 20, 1968.

"Youth Art Show Planned Tomorrow at 5 Points Park." Durham Morning Herald, May 17, 1968.

"Sharing their Books." The Durham Sun, July 6, 1968. (Re: The experienced story approach to reading)

"IQs Grow as Schools Feed Undernourished Minds." Raleigh News and Observer (Section IV, pp. 1, 12), July 14, 1968.

"For Pearson Children, Schools' a Lark." Raleigh News and Observer (Section IV, pp. 1, 12), July 14, 1968.

"Low IQs Among Poor Often Environmental." Today's Child, 16 (7), September 1968.

"Massive Study of Disadvantaged." Educational Leadership, December 1968.

"EIP Accentuates the Positive and Eliminates the Negative." Durham Housing Authority Newsletter, January 1969.

Brandt, R. M. Opinions Differ: The Durham Education Improvement Program. Today's Education, February 1969, 58 (2), 62-64.

"Durham's EIP Is Topic of Articles in NEA Journal." The Durham Sun, February 1969.

Whittenton, Burwell. "Wide Exposure on Tap." The Durham Sun, February 28, 1969. (Re: Dr. Jack Edling's Teaching Research Project describing EIP and other programs)

Walmus, Vicki. "Pregnant Girl School Application is Tabled." Durham Morning Herald (Section A, p. 3), April 23, 1969.

"Book Nook." Durham Morning Herald, June 8, 1969. (Re: Authors' Day at Southside School)

"EIP Experiment Enters Final Year." The Duke Chronicle, November 1, 1969.

Miscellaneous Articles about EIP (continued)

"5 Durham Area Profs to Give Talks." The Durham Sun, December 10, 1969. (Re: Dr. Spaulding's speech to the National Conference on Early Childhood)

"Child-Size City of Learning." Durham Morning Herald, June 14, 1970. (Re: Dramatic play)

"Emphasis: Individual Growth - Southside School, Durham, North Carolina." No. 20 of 46 Case Studies developed by Jack V. Edling, Project Director, Teaching Research Division, Oregon State System of Higher Education, Supported in Part by the Research Utilization Branch, U. S. Office of Education, 1970.

Television Coverage

"Dramatic Play at EIP." Today Show, May 1970.

Appendix B

Resources Available to EIP Personnel in the Instructional Materials Center

Appendix B

Resources Available to EIP Personnel in the Instructional Materials Center

Instructional Aids and Equipment - all common types

Professional Books - approximately 1,100 titles

Children's Books - approximately 2,500 titles

Teacher's Guides and Curriculum Outlines - approximately 1,700 titles

Curriculum Materials and Equipment Used in EIP Experimental Programs

Automated Equipment

Language Masters
Typewriters
Filmstrip projectors and sets of filmstrips
Tape recorders
Record players
Sound films (rented from the University of North Carolina Film Library)
Silent films (8mm film loops)
Overhead projectors
Video tape recorders
Sewing machines

Sensory Motor Development

Marianne Frostig Perceptual Training Materials
Shop equipment (wood tools and equipment)
Sensory Motor Activities for Early Childhood by Diane Turner, EIP
Handwriting with Write and See (Lyons and Carnahan, Inc.)
Better Handwriting for You (Noble and Noble)

Science

Materials for physical and biological science
Cooking facilities, equipment and curriculum guides
Science is Learning by Wilbur L. Beauchamp (Scott Foresman)
Science Curriculum Units from Palo Alto Unified School District, California
Nature study materials
Sewing materials and curriculum guides
Picture Story Print Sets (Society for Visual Education, Inc.)
Today's Basic Science (Harper & Row, 1969)
Science (Silver Burdett, 1968)
Elementary School Science by Blough and Schwartz (Holt, Rinehart & Winston)

Social Studies

Words and Action (Role Playing Pictures by Fannie Shaftel)
Nimnicht-Meier Social Studies (Pre-School Games)
Man in Action Series (Prentice-Hall, Inc.)
Our Working World records and workbooks (Science Research Associates)
Social Studies Curriculum Guides from the Palo Alto Unified School District, California
Social Studies, Primary Grades (Teachers Publishing Corporation, Darien, Connecticut)

Reading

Words In Color by Caleb Gattegno
Language Experience in Reading by Van Allen (Encyclopedia Brittanica Corp.)
Durrell-Murphy Phonics Practice Program (Boston University)
Sullivan Programmed Readers (McGraw-Hill)
Reading in the Elementary School (self-selection) (Ronald Press)
Basic Reading Series by Rasmussen & Goldberg (Science Research Associates)
Reading Labs IA and IB (Science Research Associates)
Basic Reading Series Satellites (a library for beginning readers) (Science Research Associates)
Word Games (Science Research Associates)
Words In Writing (Harr Wagner)
Remedial Techniques in Basic School Subjects by Grace Fernald (McGraw-Hill)
Scott Foresman Basal Series (up to Fall 1969)
Ginn & Company Basal Series (up to Fall 1969)
Once Upon a Time and I Know a Story (Harper & Row Series)
Allyn Basal Textbook Series (adopted in North Carolina 1969-1970)
MacMillan Basal Textbook Series (adopted in North Carolina 1969-1970)
Benefic Press Books
Scholastic Readers' Choice (paperbacks)
Read & Do Masters for Worksheets (Milliken Publishing Company, St. Louis, Missouri)
Weekly Reader
Scholastic Magazine
Spice by Mary Platts, Sr. Rose Marguerite, and Esther Shumaker
Manuscript in Applied Phonics by Diane Coates and Julia Rogers (Boston University)
Manuscript in Applied Phonics in the Primary Grades by Donald Durrell and Helen Murphy (Boston University)
The Other Children by Knoxville City Schools (Harper & Row)

Mathematics

Individually Prescribed Instruction (Research for Better Schools, Philadelphia)
Math Workshop by Wirtz-Botel (Encyclopedia Brittanica)
Sets and Numbers by Patrick Suppes (L. W. Singer)
Greater Cleveland Math Program (Science Research Associates)
Cuisenaire Rods (Cuisenaire Corporation of America)
Pre-Number Ideas by Lucas and Neufield (Holt, Rinehart & Winston)
The Laidlaw Math Series (Sets, Number Numerals)
Mathematics Laboratory Materials by Lore Rasmussen (Learning Innovations Corporation, New York City)
Number Master Sheets (Milliken Publishing Company, St. Louis, Missouri)
Individualized Mathematics Systems (IMS) (Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia)

Sound and Speech Articulation

Language Stimulation by Jane Taylor, EIP
Sound Recognition records

Language and Vocabulary Syntax and Usage

EIP Language Program for Culturally Disadvantaged by Harriet Shenkman
Peabody Language Development Kit - Kindergarten & First Grade
Kit-A-Language (Ginn)
Silver Burdett Spelling Program
From Sounds to Words
Spell Correctly - Grades 2, 3, 4
The Macmillan English Series
Detect (Science Research Associates)
Skills in Spelling by Brener, H. Nevill, and Gwendolyn Long (revised - McCormick-Mather Publishing Company)
The Roberts English Series
"Productivity-Responsiveness" tasks (N. C. State Psychology Department, Raleigh)
"Similarities and Differences" tasks (N. C. State Psychology Department, Raleigh)
French Words In Color by Caleb Gattegno

Appendix C

Impact of the Durham Education Improvement Program

Appendix C

Impact of the Durham Education Improvement Program

(A Report Submitted to the Coordinating Committee)

I. Introduction and Purpose

In the spring of 1970, Educational Testing Service was asked to propose a series of steps by which to examine the impact of the Durham Education Improvement Program on the city and county school systems, the community at large, and the nearby region of North Carolina. A plan was adopted which would permit a backward examination of the five-year operations of this program, but which would also involve considerable investigation at the end of the grant period as a way of getting at the "final" status of impact. It was understood that the ETS study would not overlap with EIP's own evaluation designs for assessing the achievement and behavioral gains made by children in the several EIP projects. Rather, we would take a broad look at the program, ascertain its major and lesser efforts, and then attempt to determine various dimensions of short- and long-range impact by studying records and publications, surveying and interviewing a large number of persons affected or involved, and determining the extent of EIP by-product and spin-off effects.

Much of the assessment has necessarily been retrospective and, thus, has been limited by lack of complete information and a sense of the program-in-operation; in addition, it has been conducted within a short span of time, and at the very time when both the school systems and EIP have been "closing down for the season." Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to expect that the outcomes will be useful in describing the multiple efforts and effects of this particular EIP, in giving focus to its activities over several years, and in outlining a procedure which could be applied by other agencies concerned with the extent of their impact. Another

potential benefit is that local public school systems may use this assessment as one basis for their continued efforts to improve the educational milieu in Durham and to apply the findings and programs of EIP. (Whatever the purposes to which the report may be put, it should be noted that the work has been conducted by an outside agency, in the same sense that many current educational evaluations are audited by independent organizations which are in a better position to be objective about the programs in question).

What is impact? Is it a unitary quality? For purposes of the present study, impact has been considered to be any of several sorts of effects of the formal program (other than effects on the many children enrolled in EIP projects): (a) effects on personal practice or conviction as perceived by people with any knowledge at all about EIP; (b) effects as indicated in formal or informal records, including publications and the press; (c) effects in the sense of service, assistance, direction, or example provided to others by EIP; (d) effects in the sense of continuing programs which were initiated or stimulated by EIP, in the public schools or otherwise; (e) effects in the sense of awareness of EIP's presence and various kinds of publicity and public relations activities. Any effects falling within these categories might break into others as well: near or distant, short- or long-range; actual or potential; intended or unanticipated. The domain is large and complex, and requires a thorough look into all available resources in order to cover the many possible kinds or instances of impact. As implied in the foregoing, impact need not be unitary; and because of the nature of EIP's plans and accomplishments, it is obvious that here we must look for a number of dimensions of effect and then attempt to relate the findings in a meaningful sense of "total" impact.

When the assessment process involved interviewing, two basic and related questions were fundamental to the conversation (though most often introduced indirectly): 1. Has it mattered that EIP was here, and in what ways? 2. What legacy will remain when the program is phased out? In this way, testimonies, recollections, impressions, reactions, opinions, and indeed facts, could be determined from persons in a wide variety of positions; and these multiple sources would serve, too, to corroborate one another as well as information gathered in other ways. When the assessment process involved the study of records, publications, and documents, the same questions were asked of the material; but of course the answers were determined in more objective terms. Since there were many resources to study in this phase of the work, again it was possible to use one means as a corroboration of the findings in other material. At the same time, contradictions were also discovered within and across interviews, records, documents, and the survey--and these had to be reckoned with.

In this connection, it goes almost without saying that the study has been greatly dependent upon the impressions and biases of a large number of people, not to mention their memories and prejudices. It was decided to rely on interview techniques, rather than broad questionnaire approaches, since interviews would better elicit feelings and opinions as well as sources of contradiction, and would provide more complete information as well. In the process, a great many facts were also uncovered, and numerous productive leads to other materials and other persons were provided. The questionnaire approach would have had to assume that all interviews were rich in both indications of impact and implications for further questions to pursue.

In addition to the limitations indicated in preceding paragraphs, it should be noted that the study was dependent to a considerable degree upon the responsiveness and availability of the many persons contacted. Also, the study was subject to

the possibility that some searches (whether of records or of persons) would be only minimally productive, and there were no predetermined indications of what kinds or amounts of impact to examine. Finally, the retrospective nature of the study has both positive and negative import: the advantages of providing and discovering hindsight, scope, and emphasis, but the disadvantage of being limited by tired memory, incomplete records, or respondents' lack of personal involvement. Discussions by the Coordinating Committee bore on some of these points, also, when consideration was being given in prior years to the assessment of impact on parents and school personnel.

While the terms "assessment" and "impact" have been used frequently here, certainly this kind of study must be considered an evaluation. Many facts and impressions have been gathered and reported, but their inter-relationships have also been noted, and their interpretation has been an important part of the work. Assessing impact means assessing the actualization of a set of objectives--whether stated or implied--and this in turn involves looking for many possible outcomes, determining the meaningfulness of those outcomes, and then judging the extent to which the program was "successful" in broad terms. There are no absolute criteria for assessing impact, but there are many aspects of a total program which, in combination, can be accepted as satisfactory evidence of positive or negative impact.

NOTE: All the sources consulted for this study are listed in the Appendix. Included are positions of all persons interviewed, bibliography of resources and publications, and listing of formal EIP records and documents.

II. EIP and Its Projects: The Total Program

Educational reform and service programs often have so many objectives and so many activities that it is difficult to distinguish them and difficult to know which came first. When the program is extensive and complex, these difficulties are increased. EIP has been all of these: extensive, complex, full of activities, and devoted to a variety of purposes. And yet, it is clear from the original proposal and the ensuing projects that EIP's goals have centered on two local needs: first, the educational, personal, and social needs of black and white disadvantaged children; and second, the need for a model and example to be used by the public school systems in effecting meaningful program changes related to poverty's children. These two overriding objectives have been stated in various ways: to institutionalize the best of EIP efforts in school programs; to change and help deprived children to better adjustment and self-development; to fight the causes and effects of poverty; to develop a model school system in the city and county; to effect curriculum reform after due research and development. Subordinate goals have also been stated, such as: to try educational theories with the disadvantaged; to assist potential young parents in deprived areas; to be innovative; to train teachers for a partially new role; to assess the effects of educational stimulation and intervention programs.

Out of all these statements, there has grown the multi-faceted program which is known as EIP and which has operated in the community for five years. Perhaps the most succinct goal-statement is that included in the 1965 proposal and subscribed to by the five participating agencies: "Yet Durham requires an <u>intensive</u> focus on a program of educational improvement to help uplift the local public schools and the children attending them" (in a context concerned with the area's impoverished citizenry). The implementation of this aim, according to the proposal,

would involve (a) the teacher-training, research, and consultation services of (what is now) North Carolina Central University and Duke University, (b) the support and educational-uplift plans of Operation Breakthrough, and (c) the development of the model school system within and with the help of the existing public school systems. In addition, Duke University was to (and did) receive the grant and serve as sole fiscal agent for the Durham EIP.

So far as we can tell from a reading of the proposal along with other evidence, the EIP staff has adhered to the emphases and particulars of the initial plan, and thus certainly the program as it exists at the end of the grant period can be related to the original concepts and purposes. Of course, there have been departures and changes along the way, affected by staff availability, by university and school conditions, or by community receptivity. These factors have undoubtedly influenced the amount and kind of positive impact, as have other factors associated with the general setting.

It is important to view the whole question of impact within two contexts--the situations in which EIP operated and the expectations set forth at the outset. As to the former, there were numerous indications of approval and willingness to support and cooperate from a wide spectrum of persons and agencies; however, the following aspects of the "environment" should be noted also, some of which were restrictive of EIP operations and potential impact. While we cannot absolutely attest to the accuracy of these factors, they have come through in interviews and the study of written materials, and some of them are a matter of record.

1. Neither (the then) N. C. College nor Duke University had special programs in early childhood education in 1965. Not until 1969 and 1970 did plans emerge.

Appendix C (continued)

2. Through the years, EIP offices and activities were located in a variety of places. There were certain advantages (for program reasons) but many people were confused as to "where EIP was" or with what agencies it was associated or the nature of its central mission. In addition, many communications and logistics problems had to be faced and solved.
3. Many difficulties were encountered in overcoming bureaucratic requirements, for example, related to getting buses for children's field trips, purchasing materials and equipment, and freeing teachers from classroom duties so that they might observe EIP projects.
4. There was, for a time, some parental apathy about their children's education and self-development. For other reasons (such as employment and large families) it was difficult to elicit the best parent participation.
5. Long-standing social customs of segregation required that EIP serve as an example in this domain in addition to its educational work. In this connection, prior to 1965, there was virtually no school integration (2 city schools), and newspapers apparently published pictures of EIP children only if they were in separate racial groups.
6. The full EIP program became operative in its fourth year. Considerable planning and negotiation were required to bring the program to its full intended flower. As a major example, it was not until 1967-1968 that Southside School became available for the strictly innovative and experimental purposes of EIP, and this in turn affected the total program and restricted EIP's intended coordination of teacher-training efforts. Also, facilities at the target schools required repairs and additions in order to equip and begin the nursery and nongraded programs.

7. Unavoidably, there were staff changes in several EIP divisions as well as various degrees of agreement with the purposes and procedures of particular research projects.
8. Again unavoidably, in so large a program, there was uncertainty among many outsiders concerning EIP's major thrusts: demonstration? inter-agency cooperation? research? model school system? service? education against poverty? All of these were implemented, but in the view of many, got in the way of each other to an extent that led to confusion and reduced potential impact.

The second important context comprises a number of expectations for EIP as set forth in the original proposal, in addition to the specific objectives already alluded to. These hoped-for outcomes may not have been controlling influences, but no doubt they affected the way EIP proceeded and the point of view from which those in and out of EIP saw its program and impact. The following selected statements are quoted directly from the 1965 proposal:

1. . . . it cannot help but gleen facts and factors at the root of learning disabilities among the impoverished and basic to (their) motivational problems.
2. . . . is the vehicle for generalization of the "model system" to other school programs in the city, county, and state.
3. . . . Scheduled for demonstration will be nursery, preschool, and non-graded primary programs.
4. The model system will in turn provide a central core of operations for the school systems where in-service training and successful instructional programs can be generalized. . .
5. It will become an example of coordinated University-Community efforts in education.

6. It will advance the notions of team teaching, ungraded classes, and in-system teacher training.
7. It will prove a valuable laboratory for the teacher-training enterprises at Duke University and North Carolina College.
8. The City and County Schools plan to take advantage of successful instructional programs and materials developed in the EIP and incorporate them into their primary educational programs.

In addition, the proposal included a list of 18 items representing conditions and programs which would reasonably benefit from the EIP venture. Notable among those which do not repeat the statements above, are: early health status of children, preschool educational patterns, development of predictors of readiness, improvement of high school counseling programs, provision of educational techniques to private and parochial schools, general increase in community participation in improvement of public schools, and preparation for public kindergartens in the state.

These many expectations relate to all four of the EIP components: research and evaluation, training, instructional program, and information services--and also to the functions of demonstration, innovation, and outreach. It is obvious that the formal and informal objectives of EIP, along with these anticipated outcomes and additional goals formulated as activities developed, made EIP indeed a comprehensive educational program with many responsibilities to fulfill. A high degree of positive impact, of course, does not require that all these plans and expectations be attained, but the "sense of impact" held by many people would be related to attainment of these original intents as well as to unanticipated effects and by-products.

Before proceeding to the study itself, a word about the total program is in order. The model system, as conceived and enacted, included over the years several groups in the infant, nursery, preschool, and ungraded primary projects--for a total of 278 different children. These subjects were studied and taught at 3 target schools, Duke Medical Center, and the Laboratory School.
It had been intended to continue with the potential parent group (and enroll their later children in the infant project), but this project did not proceed as anticipated. Other active components were these: follow-up of ungraded class completers; Youth program; parent groups; study of control subjects; teacher training; instructional materials center; social services; research and evaluation; publications and information services.

This large enterprise, in effect, applied a treatment to the Durham area: an attempt to improve a number of traditional educational practices through the work of educators and researchers. We have tried to briefly indicate what that treatment was and how it was originated and promoted. Now let us take a look at the EIP image that emerged, the facts and hopes regarding what was accomplished in the community and elsewhere, and the impressions as well as convictions of a number of people concerned and involved.

III. The Search for Impact

Preliminary Survey

Teachers and others, at 3 city and 2 county schools, were polled in early June on the extent of the their awareness of EIP and its various projects. (See Appendix 1 for a copy of the instrument, and Appendix 5 for a list of respondents by schools). These schools were chosen by lots from among those which were reported to have no ties to EIP components, and questionnaires were handed to as many persons as cared to participate. It was the intention to discover whether

teachers and other staff on the periphery of the EIP endeavor had substantial knowledge of it or reactions to it; if they did, then a more detailed survey of all school staff in the two systems would appear justified.

As it turned out, it was judged that their knowledge and contact were quite limited, especially in view of the facts that (1) EIP had existed for 5 years, and (2) three of the five schools had had some direct touch with EIP after all. One school was the departure point for busing neighborhood children to the Laboratory School, and also it had "lost" a number of its children and 1 teacher to the EIP program; another school's principal and some teachers had "studied EIP" and had strong feelings about its continuation; a third school had enrolled some EIP children in 1969-1970 who were extensively tested in the spring. A few teachers in each of the five schools had visited one or another of the EIP target schools, and several had attended workshops conducted by the program staff. Thus, an unanticipated outcome of the survey was the implication that virtually all of the 30 elementary schools in the two districts had contact in some way (whether visits, shop-talk, workshops, EIP children in the school, or testing), even though only 4 were official EIP schools and 8 others had EIP 4th grade "graduates" whose teachers were provided with consulting and testing help by project staff.

However, this is not to suggest that all school personnel were affected by EIP directly or indirectly. As indicated in survey data as well as interview content, a number of individuals including principals and other administrative staff, had very limited knowledge of EIP's various activities and were unaware of its local impact. As to the preliminary survey, a total of 50 staff members were polled in the 5 schools and 8 other school people also responded. A summary of their responses is shown on page 13, and it can be seen that all questions were

answered YES by some and that all EIP-related projects or agencies were recognized by some. It is clear, if we accept the responses at face value, that these school people have been aware of EIP (see items 3, 4, 5, 6a, 7a); but items 6 and 7 indicate a much smaller degree of actual visitation at the target schools. Furthermore, of the 22 city people polled, only 5 responded YES to items 6 and 7; the larger share of actual visiting and observing was reported by the 36 county school respondents. For item 8, there were only 11 YES responses (and these related primarily to other sources of information rather than other aspects of the EIP total program). It is worthwhile noting, too, that 15 people reported EIP workshop attendance (item 10) while a number of other components had been "heard of" (item 11). It appears that most had heard of Follow-Through (a non-EIP agency), but fewer than half had heard of major components or offshoots of EIP, notable FEAST, Cooperative School for Girls, the Model System, Lab School, Instructional Materials Center, and the Youth Program.

Appendix C (continued)

Survey Summary

		YES	NO
3. Have you heard of the Durham EIP?	3.	45	12
4. Did you know it was a set of projects to study and aid education generally in this area?	4.	42	14
5. Have you heard other teachers (in this or any other school) talk about EIP projects or the "model system?"	5.	35	22
6. Have you visited Southside School?	6.	12	45
If not, have you heard about it?	6a.	30	15
Have you considered visiting it and its EIP projects?	6b.	20	24
7. Have you visited the ungraded primary in any of these schools? Pearson? Edgemont? Lakeview?	7.	17	37
If not, have you heard about these ungraded primaries?.	7a.	33	6
8. Have you been aware of EIP for other reasons than the above?. .	8.	11	36
Please specify: (Consultants, health services, EIP graduates, shop-talk, publicity, headstart, summer course, project staff)			
9. From your acquaintance with EIP, do you feel it has served useful functions in the community and schools?	9.	34	7
Should various EIP projects be continued, do you feel?	9a.	26	3
Which? (ungraded schools, health services, pre-school, research, Cooperative School, Follow-Through)			
10. Have you attended summer or school-year workshops directed by any of the following persons and concerned with language, reading, methods and materials, speech or speech therapy? . . .	10.	15	41
Dr. Golden, Dr. Anastasiow, Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Cooper, Mrs. Shenkman			
Did you associate the workshop (s) with the Durham EIP?	10a.	14	17
Did you feel the workshop (s) should be continued or repeated?	10b.	21	3

11. Check those you have heard of:

4 FEAST	24 Cooperative School for Girls
26 EIP Lab School	13 EIP Youth Program
14 Model System	22 EIP Preschool project
40 Durham Follow-Through	12 EIP infant project
15 EIP Youth Center	10 "Educators in ACTION"
6 IMS	16 EIP Instructional Materials Center

12. Other comments (or questions). (Should continue, not good for regular classes, valuable programs, would like to know more about goals, staff is hand-picked, should be followed up, not enough publicity)

The following observations are made on the basis of the survey responses:

1. EIP was best known for its work in the ungraded classroom. Respondents indicated hearing of and visiting these classes to a much greater degree than they revealed acquaintance with other EIP components.
2. This point is especially important when we look at responses to items 9 and 9a. Though relatively few persons visited schools or had even heard of other EIP components, large numbers felt that EIP had "served useful functions" and "should be continued." In 9 individual cases, respondents who had not visited any school nevertheless marked YES to 9 and 9a. We get the feeling that limited knowledge led in many cases to wholesale approval; this is regrettable.
3. Equally regrettable, in terms of implied impact, is the fact that while some persons omitted evaluation (9 and 9a), others indicated approval and yet listed no important components for continuation. We conclude that many persons were acquainted with EIP's projects, but that there was among this group no special impact except as related to the ungraded classroom.
4. Open-ended commentary (items 8, 9, 12) was limited to a small number. For item 8, 16 persons commented; the largest number of entries (4) concerned difficulties in getting EIP graduates to adjust to the "normal" classroom routine; most other comments related to sources of general information about EIP. For item 9, 15 persons commented; 4 entered "nongraded" while 5 others listed particular EIP schools; the remaining entries were: health services, preschool, social adjustment, Model System, Cooperative School, in-service training for kindergarten, and research. This last list is impressive indeed, and implies meaningful impact; however, it represents the comments of only 6 persons. For

item 12, there were 7 responses concerned with implementation problems, need for continuation and follow-up, personnel selection, desire for more information, and general approval.

5. For items 10, 10a, and 10b there is some concern. There was evidence that respondents may have confused EIP workshops with university courses offered by the same professionals. Also, 8 persons responded NO to items 10 and 10a, and yet indicated YES to item 10b concerned with continuation of the workshops.

6. As suggested earlier, it appears safe to generalize from this survey to other schools on the periphery of EIP, and to suggest that most schools in the area had had some sort of contact with EIP and that most teachers in the two systems were acquainted with EIP's presence in the community. However, it also appears that the level of acquaintance on the periphery was not high, that awareness was pretty much limited to the most obvious component (the ungraded classroom), and that there was little meaningful impact on those polled beyond the acceptance given to the nongraded approach.

EIP Records

As shown in the first half of Appendix 3, a number of formal EIP records were studied. There were three major reasons for consulting these: first, to become better acquainted with the total program; second, to discover leads concerning impact which should be followed; and third, to uncover direct evidence concerning the nature and extent of impact. This section will report on the indications of EIP's impact; the records are not unified and must be reported on separately.

A. Four or five EIP seminars were conducted in 1967-68, dealing with behavior modification, disadvantagement, and ungraded schools. Persons

were in attendance from Duke, NCCU, and the University of North Carolina; Durham County Schools; and N. C. Department of Public Instruction. The seminars bespeak an outreach effort by EIP staff. On the other hand, they continued for but one year; and beyond the existence of the transcripts, no record or reference was found which suggested specific actions taken because of the seminars. Presumably, the seminars served as a vehicle of professional communication among a group of approximately 20 persons.

B. The record shows that 278 different children participated in the model system (30 in the infant project, 86 in the nursery preschool, and 176 in ungraded primaries--14 were counted in both infant and preschool groups) for at least 5 months, which was the arbitrary period determined for expecting any lasting social or academic effects. About 75 subjects were in the system for 3 or 4 successive years. These two totals (278 and 75) strongly suggest positive impact in that most children remained in the program for more than one year, and many for 3 or 4 years. Two groups began at age 5 in 1965, remained in the program for 4 years, and in the fifth year were followed-up in their "regular" 4th grade classes in various schools; 22 children are represented in these 2 groups. Note that as many as 26 children entered infant and nursery projects in the fourth program year, and 22 of this group completed the final 2 years of the projects. While recruiting and keeping children was a major effort, obviously many families continued their offspring in EIP--presumably after they saw the program and changed behaviors as benefits to the children.

C. The minutes of the Coordinating Committee present an interesting array of commentary, most concerned with program operations. A number of

Appendix C (continued)

entries suggest a degree of positive impact, however: (1) EIP director made a total of 16 addresses to professional meetings or seminars in a 3-year period. (2) In the fall of 1969, several breakins were reported at the Laboratory School; investigation revealed that some children were returning to "their" school after hours to play. Nothing missing or broken. (3) City superintendent reported in fall 1968 that FEAST food services vocational program was a continuing success. (4) One outside consultation service and group of visits was reported in the minutes, that of school personnel from Aiken, S. C., interested in initiating a preschool for the disadvantaged. (5) A request from a southern university was received, asking that it and EIP jointly set up a pre-doctoral internship for school psychologists; reaction was positive (although no action taken). (6) In 1966 and 1967, notice was taken of the travels and reception of the EIP Exhibit. (7) A valuable social service collaboration was undertaken with other local agencies also serving EIP families. One instance of negative impact was included: There were problems in 1966 with the Youth Program, revolving around dropout of white youngsters because of attitudes toward "integrated activities."

D. The newspaper file, kept from 1964 to the end of 1969, shows a total of 88 articles of all sorts. By year, the tally is as follows:

1964 . . . 3	1967 . . . 38
1965 . . . 13	1968 . . . 7
1966 . . . 23	1969 . . . 4

This coverage was primarily in Durham papers, but included articles elsewhere, as follows:

Richmond, Va., 1965	New York Times, 1965 (1 full column)
Raleigh, N. C., 1966, 1967, 1968	Macon, Ga., 1968
Today's Child, 1968	Time Magazine, 1966 (1 photograph)
	Chapel Hill, N. C., 1966

The Times Educational Supplement, 1967 (extended reference to EIP)
Column by Ralph McGill, 1967, in Washington, D. C., Tacoma, Wash., Atlanta, Palo Alto, Cal. (extensive coverage of Durham EIP)

In addition, a full-page feature article appeared in a Durham paper in June 1970, including program descriptions, interview content, and classroom photos. This article resulted from a Durham policeman's having taken EIP children on a police station tour; he was enthused about EIP, and suggested that a reporter do an article before EIP operations closed down.

Another sort of breakdown is perhaps more useful in suggesting impact above and beyond sheer numbers of entries. Of the 74 local articles (1964 to 1969) 9 concerned personnel additions to EIP, 28 gave in-depth coverage to research reports, conferences, or speeches; 8 others were evening repetition of the latter category; and 29 were very brief references to EIP. One can conclude from this tally only moderate impact as measured by press coverage, particularly since approximately 50% of the entries were EIP press releases. The non-local coverage is more indicative of impact, but there was very little of this. In a few instances the articles were solicited by the press or were written at the behest of other groups.

A notable omission in the press content is reporting of classroom activities and indications of "new things to come" in public education. Likewise, there were no requests for parents to enroll their children or information given on how to learn more about EIP. The bulk of the content related to the purposes of the program and its research reports, and did not provide a sense that EIP had made an impact and the community was responding.

E. The third annual report to the Coordinating Committee (1968) indicated certain program features beyond the original proposal guidelines, and these were construed to represent areas of positive impact, particularly impact on the problems of poverty: (1) the Youth Program, involving older siblings of EIP children, and giving vocational experience in design as well as food services, (2) the school program for pregnant high school girls, (3) the social services component, involving mothers-and-children and recreational and social opportunities for mothers alone.

F. Volume III of the Final Report (1970) provides abstracts of 69 special reports on a variety of professional topics. These have been made available through the years to those requesting them. In addition, an annotated bibliography of 142 items gives further evidence of impact when viewed in these categories: 21 speeches, 5 position papers, 7 curriculum guides, 2 EIP tests, 4 abstracts, 89 unpublished reports, and 14 published articles. The latter have appeared under 12 authors' names in such journals as Exceptional Children, Social Casework, The PTA Magazine, Today's Education, Elementary School Journal, Psychonomic Science, and Journal of Experimental Child Psychology. No information is available regarding the extent of journal readership, but the next section indicates something of the nature of written requests for papers and reports.

G. The file of requests for EIP publications revealed that about half were for "general information" while the remainder were for particular papers or publications including annual reports. Very seldom did the requester indicate his source: 6 mentioned a journal article, 3 referred to an EIP publication by a staff member. Considering the number of requests from a distance, no doubt news articles, professional publications,

speeches, and general word-of-mouth accounted for a large share of the requests. Three groups of persons appear to predominate: nursery and kindergarten teachers and those planning ungraded programs; staff members at various child development centers and institutes; college and university instructors.

The file reveals 160 written requests in the period 1968-70; requests came from at least 30 states and from 6 foreign countries, in many instances with repeat requests for additional publications. Surprisingly, this correspondence includes only 1 request to be put on the mailing list, and 1 request for a date to visit EIP.

As in the case of news coverage and research reports in the professional journals, there is no way to estimate the ways in which these persons may have put the EIP publications to use. The fact of repeat requests is indicative of some sort of impact, but at the best we can only suggest that a considerable widespread interest was generated in the EIP venture as indicated by these records.

H. Finally, the record of visits made from 1965 to 1970 was studied; there was a total of 437 persons whose tours and visits were arranged by the office of information services. Undoubtedly there were unrecorded visits as well, as when EIP staff toured visiting colleagues both local and distant. The record indicates the following number of visitors by year, for a total of 437:

1965: 1 1966: 38 1967: 197 1968: 94 1969: 67 1970: 40

Of greater meaning may be the breakdown which shows 157 school people (teachers, supervisors, administrators), 218 university, college, and child-study center professionals, and 62 in miscellaneous categories

Appendix C (continued)

(such as other EIPs, professional organizations, Ford Foundation, social workers, publishers, regional labs, and so on). Visitors came from around the country and abroad, from many different university settings, and from many public school systems, often singly and as often in groups of up to 20 persons.

With respect to potential impact of these visits (and it is not known whether a "visit" meant discussion, study of materials, observation in a school, or all of these), two factors should be noted: Of the 218 university-college-center visitors, 179 were from local universities (Duke, NCCU, and University of N. C.). Yet of the 157 school people, only 35 came from the immediate Durham area. One might speculate that local researchers saw greater value in EIP than did school personnel; or that local school people tended to see EIP as an experimental operation more than a demonstration one. In any case, the record shows that these 35 school visitors came in 1966, 67, and 68.

In cases where visitors stayed more than 1 day (some up to 5 days), they are counted only once. In a few instances (about 10), visitors made arrangements to visit again and their repeat visits are counted in the total of 437. Approximately 40 students (graduate and undergraduate) are included in the count for college-university professionals.

So far as can easily be determined, 2 or 3 university professors took several groups of colleagues and students on different occasions. More important for impact is the fact that several localities sent 2 or 3 different teams of visitors to EIP (or had the same team visit again) while they were in the planning stages for either preschools or ungraded primaries. Among these were 2 city school systems in S. C.,

3 county systems in N. C., 2 city systems in N. C., and the N. C. Department of Public Instruction.

Certainly the number of visitors is impressive, as is the fact that they were from a number of school systems and agencies and college-universities. Except in the few cases where specific local action was taken and credit given to EIP for its aid, no information exists as to actual impact of these visits. Many persons were no doubt "passing through" while many others were serious students of the whole EIP concept. It appears safe, however, to infer positive EIP impact, based on visitor records, because of the number of visits, the distances from which many persons came, the repeat visits, and the particular programs which were developed using the Durham EIP as a model or at least example.

Other Resources and Publications

The second half of Appendix 3 lists materials studied other than EIP records. This includes the original proposal, various EIP pamphlets, a few letters, proposals written for other agencies, and miscellaneous reports. (In addition, another 10 research reports and program descriptions were read, but are not cited because they do not bear directly on the question of impact). For convenience, the materials are treated in 5 categories.

A. Letters. The 1968 letter to Greene County (Director of Preschool Development) is one of several that bear witness to EIP's direct involvement in teacher-training for that preschool; this relationship is amplified in the following section on interviews.

The June 1970 letter from a group of 10 parents to the Durham City School Board gives real testimony to EIP impact, though indirectly. Interview content again will amplify the relationship between Lakewood School and EIP; suffice it to

say that the school staff credits EIP with promoting the idea of the ungraded primary and then helping them to establish one in 1969-70. The letter petitions the school board to continue the ungraded program, and refers to a previous 90-signature petition and a questionnaire for parents; in all three instances the parents were distinctly favorable to the ungraded program, and apparently felt that petitioning was necessary for its continuation.

B. Proposals. EIP staff either wrote or assisted in writing several proposals for other agencies including Durham Follow-Through, RELCV, N. C. Governor's Commission Report, Greene County (N.C.) preschool, Cooperative School, Aiken (S.C.) preschool, and LINC; copies of the first two named were available. This whole area of assistance to other educational groups indicates positive impact, and in the case of these 2 programs clearly made real contributions at the beginning points. In 1968-69, EIP staff assisted RELCV in planning for a second-generation of individualized instruction in mathematics, and the preliminary plan was the result. In 1967, EIP wrote the original full proposal for Follow-Through, a program with many of the same academic and social aims for children as EIP had.

C. Publications. Language Stimulation I and II, written in 1969 as an instructional aid for EIP classes, was widely distributed among teachers who visited EIP schools and has been viewed by LINC staff as a particularly useful source. Educators in Action, a cooperative monthly newsletter among 5 agencies, was published from March 1967 to July 1968 under the editorship of an EIP staffer and with the purpose of covering all local educational programs and events. Its final mailing list was 2500, the largest share of whom were city and county teachers; others were N. C. superintendents, visitors to EIP, N. C. libraries, state and national legislators, and numerous educational agencies around the country. It was not devoted to EIP in particular, and was discontinued in favor of giving EIP time to communicate with local community action groups,

ESEA councils, and so on. There is no record of any inquiry as to why the publication stopped or when it would be resumed.

Several pamphlets were printed which were directed to parents of EIP children, giving information about the program and reporting on the activities of mothers' groups. "Pulling Up Parents" was published regularly for 2 years (1966-68).

D. Reports. An out-of-state superintendent recently visited EIP and reported on his impressions. He indicated very favorable reactions, particularly to "teachers who had learned to care about pupils" and to the objectives of the total program. His opinion was that the actual school program could be implemented most anywhere, with the implication that he intended to move in this direction at home. He saw the best evaluation of EIP in the breakin incident at the Laboratory School, alluded to earlier, where children wanted to spend Saturday and Sunday at "their" school.

In the years 1968, 69, and 70, five Ford Scholars (in leadership training programs) observed and worked with the Durham EIP, varying from 3 weeks to 2 months. In addition to the information given below, it may be noted that one Scholar was a teacher interested in feasible innovations and another prepared a proposal with EIP staff help, for setting up a preschool in her own poverty home area. As to the reports, one writer indicated very positive feelings about EIP's efforts particularly with black disadvantaged children and responded to the many examples of good leadership she saw at work in the program. The other Scholar favored the "action" aspects of EIP, but felt that the research program "was good for the researchers but not for the children."

E. Public Relations and Information Pieces. A portable exhibit was prepared for use at professional meetings in and out of the state; staff members

felt it to be successful in promoting EIP interest by the end of the third program year and discontinued it. No records were kept concerning possible impact except the list of several places where the exhibit was shown. The only other EIP piece studied was "The House at Lakeview," a collection of experience stories written by the children.

EIP's presence and service in the community has been acknowledged in the informational pamphlet of the Cooperative School for Pregnant Girls, in two personnel brochures of the county school system (the larger of which was prepared by an EIP staff member whose contribution has often been acknowledged), and in the 1970 Directory of Community Services. In the latter, EIP is described in its own right. The county schools in listing "special projects," includes a "non-graded program in some schools," which reflects the efforts of both EIP and the Comprehensive School Improvement Program.

Interviews

As indicated in Appendix 2, 91 interviews were conducted--70 in person and 21 by telephone. Two groups predominated: city and county school personnel (40, including 8 EIP teachers), and 30 representatives of a large number of educational agencies. In addition, 10 parents of EIP children were contacted, as well as 6 present members and 5 former members of the EIP professional staff. Surprisingly, every person was available except two among those initially listed or suggested later for contact.

In view of the tight schedule, the degree of cooperation and punctuality of interviewees was surprising and pleasant. A good 90% of these persons were cordial and helpful and more than willing to answer a variety of questions as well as engage in general conversation. An interview outline was employed in the first week or so, but after experience was gained the three interviewers began to frame the task in such a way that interviewees started to "carry the ball." Only a

very few persons were difficult to communicate with, or had extremely limited knowledge of EIP, while the majority were helpful to the extent that one might infer a fair degree of previous positive impact: EIP had been perceived favorably and consequently these people were glad to assist. One other note: most interviews took between 1/2 and 3/4 of an hour; some were shorter than that and a few were considerably longer.

The Introduction discusses the reason for extensive use of the interview technique in this study, and also points out certain inescapable limitations. It is important to note, too, that interviewees tended to reveal their feelings and impressions about community or EIP or school system circumstances; they may have been mistaken at times in point of actual fact, but what was important to them (and to this report) was their perceptions, whether positive or negative. Since no prescribed interview schedule was used and since questions were based on the individual's relationships to EIP, what emerged in most cases (with probing as needed) was that which was meaningful or primary from the point of view of the respondents. In a few cases, this meant that a person had a negative reaction he wished to drive home, but our impression was that on the whole the interviewees were honest and thorough in their reactions and were generally quite favorable toward EIP.

The interview content was extensive and cannot be reported in complete detail. It seems appropriate first to characterize the level of awareness of EIP among the respondents and then to ask certain questions of the total content.

Not surprisingly, when it comes to appearing informed about the total EIP program and indicating awareness of its potential and impact, EIP staff and teachers rank highest. This group of the best-informed (about 20 in all) includes the director of the Cooperative School and the principals of the target

schools; and also a few persons who were essentially outsiders to EIP: a city school principal, an education professor at NCCU, a member of the city school administrative staff, and a Duke physician. At the other end of the information-and-awareness spectrum, as suggested by interview responses, are about 25 people: a number of the parents, several elementary teachers and principals, a Duke physician, a Ford Scholar, a few members of the school administrative staffs and a few professionals at other educational agencies (in Durham and elsewhere). In fairness, it should be noted that some members of this latter group could not be expected to be more informed or aware, and several others voluntarily acknowledged their lack of awareness and even their failure to become more involved. The "middle half" of the total group appeared moderately knowledgeable of the broad EIP program, but their point of reference or awareness of impact was usually restricted to one or two program sements (e.g., the youth program, the ungraded primary, or the dissemination efforts).

A. How has the Model School System been perceived? In most cases respondents were not certain of the referent but seemed to know about particular program components; even one target school principal saw the "model" as the ungraded primary. On the positive side, one target principal, a Duke physician, a director of elementary education, the director of Operation Breakthrough, and the city director of vocational education spoke of the EIP projects as a spectrum from infancy to the upper grades and as part of a total concept of education. Apparently very few people saw the broad continuum intended by EIP; perhaps partly because so few children could be enrolled in more than two program components in the 5-year period, and because EIP facilities and programs were housed in several separated locations.

Appendix C (continued)

B. Have the children benefited? A total of 35 persons (all local) spoke on this subject, most of them without a direct question, and all in terms of either the preschool or the ungraded primary experience. A few had both negative and positive comments, but more than two thirds of the 59 responses were positive. Only comments which gave particulars are included here, and except for 4 persons (teacher, former psychologist, principal, and social worker) the comments of EIP personnel are not reported. Represented on both the positive and negative sides are parents, EIP staff, principals, Ford Scholars, teachers, elementary directors, and supervisors; in addition, an associate superintendent and a college professor spoke only in positive terms. NEGATIVE INDICATORS: 1) behavior-reinforcement techniques hurt some children; 2) EIP graduates not academically ready for regular grade 4--4 comments; 3) children played and did not learn--3 comments including 1 parent; 4) research got in the way of teaching children; 5) difficult for children to adjust to discipline in regular grade 4--9 comments. POSITIVE INDICATORS: 1) enriching experience--4 comments; 2) stimulated learning and creativity--4; 3) learned to be independent, choose own work, pace themselves--5, including regular teachers of EIP graduates; 4) better academic preparation and verbalize more--5; 5) better social adjustment (positive attitudes, less prejudice, confidence, at ease with adults, share, express selves, comfortable in school) --20; 6) like school (returned after hours)--3 comments.

These are opinions and not the result of measuring children in these terms. But the fact that some people had both negative and positive comments lends credibility to the whole group and to the meaningfulness of this view of impact--in many cases the people who said that children had benefited also felt that EIP programs should be continued. What also emerges--not surprisingly--is the problem of incompatible philosophies of education. Many respondents clearly

hold to the view that by given grade-age points in the primary school certain learnings "should" have taken place, while others have quite different values. Some quotations will be useful here: "When children phased into regular schools, they simply haven't adjusted as well, and way behind academically." "If those EIP kids were behind academically, don't forget they were picked in the first place because they were deprived and needed help as well as study."

". . . they learned to govern themselves and to <u>learn</u> at the same time."

"Most of our visitors noticed their independence and what some call "productive noise" . . ." "My boy has a different (better) feeling about school than what you think kids have." "Math is the really weak part of EIP."

In addition are some contradictions, and these seem especially pertinent because they reflect the honest confusion over values which many people have. Even though such contradictions are widespread and not new, apparently EIP served to bring these confusions to the surface--and even this can be recognized as a positive sort of impact. The following are paraphrased from the comments of a principal and 2 teachers (all non-EIP), and a parent of two EIP children.

1) Valued the freedom children had to express themselves, to explore, to still be learning--yet felt that EIP children should be spanked when it is needed.

2) In the EIP school they had trips, made things, talked a lot, they <u>did</u> a lot of things; but here with me they <u>learned</u>--yet also said "A lot of children need environmental assistance and to learn how to get along, and these children did learn a better adjustment in general."

3) Kids need help with decision-making; they should have been told what to do and when to do it in EIP; "I prefer this method"--yet favors the ungraded primary in the whole school system; "The children learn self-confidence and how to express themselves better."

4) Deportment? These EIP children were always noisy, shuffling, moving, talking, it was just terrible--yet said "Well, yes they were better prepared and I think EIP helped them; children do need freedom, too, you know."

C. How has the impact on parents been evident? From all indications, parents . . . like teachers and other professionals . . . tended to equate EIP with one component: usually the ungraded class but sometimes also the preschool and nursery. Another general comment is that when parents enrolled their children in EIP, they were typically suspicious and uncommunicative; over time, this pattern changed dramatically for many of the parents.

One EIP principal reported that "his" parents were mostly neutral about school in general, and he had found no negative reaction over the fact that EIP and the ungraded class would be terminated. However, another EIP principal reported the opposite: parents had expressed their wish that both would continue, and felt that "kids get a better break in EIP." Three parents specifically voiced their disappointment over the termination. Most indicative was the report of the last parent meeting at the Laboratory School (June 2). At that time, 75% of the parent group attended (5 middle-class and 15 working-class, black and white); they expressed deep regret over EIP termination and discussed possibility of working up a petition.

All 10 parents indicated that they were happy about what EIP had provided for their children: better adjustment, get along with everyone--3; rich array of experiences--3; fact that teacher dealt directly with child--3; eager to attend school, wears a smile--5; not as shy as expected, talks easily even with adults--4. (But there was also concern for the transition into regular classrooms: two parents said their children had a rough time last year catching on to the 4th grade

routine and felt stifled; two others anticipated problems next year, one saying the home would probably be blamed for "poor training," and the other that her child will definitely be bored in school). Two EIP principals indicated that numerous parents had inquired about enrolling their children in EIP because of what they had heard, and the third EIP principal also noted that in May several parents had volunteered that they were glad their children had been in the ungraded primary. Two negative notes: a parent said her two children had not learned their numbers in EIP--and a "downtown" school official reported that at the outset many parents had called to say they were unhappy because of no conferences or report cards; since the first year, "there have been no more complaints." And one strong positive note: one family with a child at the Laboratory School for 2 years moved 20 miles away; during 1969-70 the parents continued the child in EIP and drove her to school each day.

As to parent contacts, there were many with the schools, the children, and even with each other over the years. "Programs" apparently were short-lived, but contact and involvement continued. The Laboratory School and 2 target schools are represented in the following items:

- A well attended PTA meeting endorsed extension of the ungraded primary to the whole school.
- EIP parents were distinctly more involved than other parents in the same school: field trips, conferences, concern, assistance to school.
- Parents slowly developed more positive attitudes toward school and children, and began to get them to school every day, and on time.
- A fathers' group met for a year at the school, talked re education, non-violence, kids, the community, and citizenship.
- Two parents: one said she found school meetings really helpful and had attended all of them; the other spoke for many, saying it was good to be able to talk with teachers individually.

- Several mothers' groups were formed and continued for some months; socializing, learning about children, learning the meaning and value of concerted concern for education.

While EIP did not plan to make efforts to train or employ poverty mothers, one parent volunteered as an aide and was hired; another became a cook and then an aide to an EIP social worker; a third served as a classroom aide and then became school clerk. One other mother worked in the Laboratory School cafeteria for 2 years, and reported the "free" feeling of the children: they played and talked more than other children, and had a good feeling about being in school.

It should be noted that interview responses reported in this section come from a city school administrator, 10 parents representing 12 children, and several EIP staffers: director of social services, curriculum director, 3 principals, 5 teachers, and 3 assistant teachers. (The parents were chosen at random from a list of 25 representing all 4 EIP schools). It was anticipated that parents might not cover all the parameters of impact, and so the responses of others were used as well.

(The Infant Project involved considerable parent contact of various kinds. However, except for 2 parental references to children having been in EIP "since birth," no comments were made about the Infant Project in the interviews in connection with parents.)

D. What indications are there of impact on the school systems? Directly and indirectly a great many interviewees spoke on this subject, expressing concern and attempting to explain relationships between EIP and the city and county schools.

There was little positive impact on the school systems. The effects of EIP most often mentioned in the interviews are classified in this report as by-products which will be treated separately as adjuncts to the educational program:

the Cooperative School for Girls, food services vocational program, and ungraded primary programs at one city and one county school. The second most frequently mentioned effect was in the area of training school personnel. EIP teachers and principals will not be absorbed into the regular system, and this was seen as a good influence by elementary directors, EIP staff, EIP teachers and principals--but seen in all cases as the potential impact on a small group of individuals who might later benefit the schools and children they work with. "This is where EIP has helped our teacher," volunteered one director, "helped the rigid traditional ones to change their classrooms for better learning." Another noted that this relatively small coterie of teachers has learned to fight the "deep-rooted idea that if children are having fun they can't be learning anything worthwhile." The fact that the Target Area C school staff was dispersed in 1970 to several schools was also noted as a source of positive impact. In addition, others noted that teachers in the target schools had learned a common-sense approach to classroom management (behavior modification), and that they will carry that with them; in one target school, the principal reported that he himself had become convinced of the value of a non-punitive approach and that four non-EIP teachers had adopted the reward-isolation techniques. Finally, EIP has trained 12 educational testers who are now on call to the school systems for special needs.

This appears to be the extent of impact felt by the schools in terms of teaching and learning in the classroom. No adoption, by the school systems as such, of any technique, plan related to the nongraded primary, team teaching, classroom discipline, curriculum, teacher-training, or other program aspects was reported by any interviewee. Both city and county administrative personnel, when asked about the future of EIP projects in the school systems, replied that

the ungraded idea was a good one but has weaknesses, so that nothing would be carried over next year because time would be needed for planning and staff training.

Other positive impacts on individual situations were noted:

- One target school principal has attempted to put the best of EIP practices into the rest of the school, emphasizing inquiry and discovery.
- The expenditure by EIP of several thousands of dollars for books, materials, supplies, etc., which will remain in system schools along with physical plant improvements donated by EIP.
- The Target Area C school in the county was seen as a model school by two administrative staffs, as a focal point for visits, observations, and sharing of ideas. (This school also represents a by-product; see section J.)
- Both city and county school personnel were grateful to EIP for a number of benefits: workshops, Instructional Materials Center (which few persons reported being aware of), consulting, visits to non-EIP schools. Some Follow-Through teachers have less rigid structure in their classes than previously and are more willing to try new ideas; EIP is credited in part for these developments.
- In one junior high school, a sex education class was organized--because of the impact of the EIP family-life course--after the demise of the EIP Youth Program. It is still in operation.

Only one negative effect was reported--by 4 teachers, 2 principals, and the city elementary director. That was the amount of classroom time taken for the testing of EIP subjects and controls in regular schools in the fall and spring. A number of other persons also mentioned this testing in passing.

On the question of the extent of positive impact in the school systems, one administrator said that he was indeed pessimistic about lasting effects--either on the system's philosophy of education or on actual classroom practice. He, and other administrative people, felt that the schools should have been closer to EIP, that stronger liaison was needed, that teachers should have observed a good deal more. It was pointed out that in the city schools a policy restricts teachers from leaving their classrooms (a point made by at least 10 persons at all levels), and that probably both school systems were inexperienced at taking advantage of an innovative program in their midst. An observation of school people as well as EIP staff was that there was no key person charged with continuing and effective liaison. Had there been, it was repeatedly suggested, then each would have asked the other for feedback, the schools would have acted more as though they were committed to see and use the implications of EIP research and practice, and EIP would have used its people and school system staff to insure that a "third system" was not being developed separately.

Apparently it was true that few non-EIP teachers were curious about the facilities or procedures being used, and that the EIP classes were somewhat isolated and separated ("We have a school nurse . . . why should EIP have its own? That fosters separatism.") And apparently it was true that neither EIP nor the school systems planned meetings with the full staffs of the target schools for the sake of demonstration and information, and that the systems were "proud" of the program but did little to study or implement it further. And apparently it was true that system supervisors were not asked by EIP to participate at the target schools, and that school system red tape got in the way of some of EIP's potential contributions to the schools. All these matters were brought out in the interviews--each by more than one person--and it seems fairly obvious that for whatever reasons there was a distinct lack of articulation between the school

systems and EIP. Indeed, it does appear that a strong liaison person might have caught these problems in communication and acted on them so that meaningful articulation might have been maintained. Feedback and communication apparently were at a minimum, particularly after the third year. But this of course is hindsight, as noted by one member of the Coordinating Committee.

There were other communications problems noted also. School people suggested that EIP did not make its facilities and materials available; if asked, EIP responded with "yes" but did not make a point of advertising possible aids to the school systems. EIP staff, on the other hand, hinted that when such overtures were made, school personnel seldom took advantage of them. An elementary director noted that "EIP got out many bulletins about what they were doing, but too many of us were too busy to read them . . ." Similarly, an EIP teacher lamented that she and others had so many EIP commitments that they did not do their part in maintaining relations with the school system: "We should have been ambassadors, but . . ." An EIP staff member suggested that public relations was a major weakness of EIP, even to the point of not working to dispel the image that Southside school had only "special education cases." And several persons remarked, on the other hand, that EIP teachers and pupils were somehow looked on as outsiders in their own schools--a sort of "they" attitude instead of "we." In addition, two local people succinctly indicated their distress over information and dissemination: "If anything good was done by EIP, none of us ever knew about it. And I was much in favor of what they set out to do." "EIP should have had a brochure like this ( ) to remind us they were here." Outside the local area, one complaint was noted by a school administrator who learned of EIP only in 1970 and he is in a nearby county. When he did learn of it, he initiated a number of visits and then specific action was taken to incorporate many EIP practices at the preschool and primary levels.

It appears that the school systems failed to embrace EIP and make best use of its presence and projects. It also appears that EIP was more concerned with research than with demonstration and pragmatic implementation. Both these views were expressed by EIP as well as school system personnel. As implied above, what emerges from a great share of the interview material is an all-around awareness of lack of communication and lack of common effort toward an improved school system at the end of the grant period. This can be viewed only as most unfortunate.

E. Will the impact on local individuals be meaningful? On the negative side, two non-EIP principals and 2 teachers stated that they could find nothing particularly useful about EIP or any ungraded program; they also acknowledged that their acquaintance with EIP was only of a few months duration and that they had heard about, but never visited, ungraded programs.

Some specific positive indications were necessarily noted in section D, but there are others. As one principal put it, "EIP has made waves, and there will be continued pressure for change. It may be a subtle thing but people are thinking and noticing now." Perhaps there is a mystique about EIP and the bonds that have been molded--several teachers, principals, and supervisors have indicated that they have a commitment now to try out new ideas, to help children learn more and better.

As to individuals, two EIP assistant teachers feel they have a calling now to the teaching profession because of their earnest involvement with EIP children and parents; (b) a non-EIP principal reported that EIP and its nongraded emphasis were here for him to study and consider, and he is now ready to try out some features; (c) an EIP staffer reported that many teachers in the schools are informed and eager to make changes in classroom procedures and curriculum; (d) a black EIP teacher told of her improvement as a teacher and a person because

of her many black-white contacts through EIP; (e) another principal: "There is no question but that the whole school should be ungraded," and reported the emotional reaction of a non-EIP traditional teacher who said, "I see the value now . . . some of those children have really benefited, they're better people." (f) a supervisor pointed out that good ideas go from teacher to teacher and she feels that EIP has been a real, though indirect, aid in disseminating notions of teaching reading and encouraging inquisitiveness in several schools; (g) an art student from UNC spent 6 weeks working with Southside children and learning from them perceptions of the world she would otherwise have missed.

F. What sorts of outreach and service is EIP known for? While there may some overlap here with by-products, both near and far, these are items which came out in the interview material. Such service is its own indication of positive impact.

- The Individualized Mathematics System of RELCV has benefited in several ways: EIP provided space for summer development work, participated in proposal development, used IMS materials in 3 schools, and participated in training workshops on several occasions.
- EIP found children in target schools for Duke University students who wished to tutor on a gratis basis, and helped train the tutors.
- EIP staff participated in workshops concerned with implementing nongraded and nursery facilities (Kinston and Reidsville, N. C., and Atlanta).
- EIP assisted the Target Area C school in its own school-wide nongraded program.
- Staff participated in a number of workshops and in-service meetings for city and county schools.
- EIP financed faculty travel to professional meetings for school people who were planning EIP-related activities.

- EIP staff wrote the proposal for the county Follow-Through program, and helped later with training, demonstration, data processing, and testing.
- Staff participated in 1970 training of teachers of migrant children as part of a LINC program, assisted in writing a proposal at the state level with LINC, and jointly developed a slide series for training purposes.
- Staff participated in training county Headstart teachers and aides.
- EIP assisted Educational Testing Service personnel in learning about the community and making contacts in connection with Sesame Street research.
- Staff consulted with Chapel Hill schools on a Title III preschool plan.
- EIP assisted Lakewood school set up its own nongraded primary program.
- The Instructional Materials Center was available to all who cared to use it.
- Staff provided extensive demonstration and consultation to the many teachers who had EIP graduates in city and county schools.
- EIP's publications, particularly Educators in Action, were seen as an information service to the community.

So far as we could tell, EIP's purposes were more in the direction of service than of outreach. When it was suggested that EIP might be of assistance, there always appeared to be a positive response and action taken, and of course some of the items listed represent intended activities in connection with EIP's program components. A number of school administrative people obviously expected a greater missionary-outreach effort on the part of EIP, but a few of them acknowledged that EIP were already involved fulltime in ongoing activities and services.

G. In what ways have visitors responded to EIP and its projects? Aside from those who felt that they could not easily implement EIP activities back home, visitors were most favorable to this program in Durham. We were told that (a) many teachers preparing for the 1969-70 statewide kindergarten program visited;

(b) that some child development classes from UNC visited as often as 5 times; (c) Lakewood teachers visited target schools, feeling it was pointless not to use the model under their noses; (d) an Alamance county principal and staff made several visits to observe and discuss the various programs; (e) state department personnel visited the Laboratory School and Target Area A school on repeated occasions while planning statewide kindergartens; (f) a county principals' group decided that all principals should visit the Target Area C school and take key teachers with them; (g) the principal and a teacher of a local private school visited the Laboratory School several times in 1968-69, and as a result have begun to give scholarships to 2 needy EIP graduates each year. And so on.

In only one instance did a negative comment turn up, and it was more neutral than negative. A principal noted that during 1969-70 nine teachers were freed from full-time classroom duty (they had student teachers); the principal said, "It never occured to me to send them to any EIP project and they never asked about it. They visited and studied in several places, but not EIP."

H. How had EIP served in the area of race relations? It appears that at the outset a number of people identified EIP with efforts to aid only the blacks in poverty, but that image has been corrected. And we have been told that integrating faculties and children caused some stir in 1965 in Durham and made difficulties in getting some projects off the ground. However, there have been particular ways in which EIP has contributed to better race relations; several of thes points were made by more than one person, and indeed, by both blacks and whites:

- The Target Area C school principal feels that when a group of white parents and children visited her school, they were surprised and pleased to hear about the ungraded primary and various enrichment materials. The principal credits EIP partially with this smoothing of the way toward integration.

- To an extent, EIP came to represent an equal-employment opportunity for qualified blacks. EIP was the first Duke "division" to be integrated (staff and students); and EIP was often called when blacks applied at Duke for more than menial jobs. In its last year, EIP was called on for recommendations of qualified blacks by various agencies in the community and nearby towns.
- In this connection, EIP gave jobs (aides, drivers, technicians, program directors) to black males . . . who could then serve as models for EIP children, be a source of community pride, and demonstrate to the white community the successful attainment and keeping of such positions.
- As to school programs, EIP provided a model for the city of good race relations on a professional research and teaching staff. (While 2 Durham schools were not segregated in 1965, their faculties were). In addition, the Laboratory School and Target Area B School PTA groups provided a further model--though difficult to initiate--of productive adult communication centered on the needs of all children.
- A supervisor indicated the EIP had helped to train and upgrade some black teachers, especially important in race relations in desegregated schools.
- A county administrator said that EIP schools had helped ease integration tensions since "children teach each other, not teachers—and EIP mixed the classes which others saw and knew was not all bad."
- Operation Breakthrough credits EIP with being a positive influence in relating poor blacks and poor whites in the community.

I. <u>Has EIP had some impact on Duke and North Carolina Central Universities?</u>

Apparently very little; as noted earlier, neither university has had an early education training program to any extent, and the departments which might have benefited from or contributed to EIP did not make extensive efforts to do so.

Of many ways in which the universities might have profited from strong attachments, it appears that Duke--through one instructor--sent a number of undergraduate prospective teachers to observe at the Laboratory School and "saw children being treated as though they could learn." In addition, several professors themselves visited EIP operations. As pointed out by an interviewee, one problem was that no one had been assigned as permanent liaison to be involved, committed, informed. Almost exactly the same observations obtain for NCCU. Four professors visited EIP schools; there was no particular liaison assigned for either EIP or Duke; a number of graduate students observed, and attended EIP workshops. At NCCU there was one added benefit: several staff members credited EIP example and assistance in NCCU's setting up its new elementary education program this year; in particular, they noted the teacher-student interaction measures developed by EIP and the various modes of classroom organization which they will promote.

Members of both departments of education lamented this minimal contact with EIP and minimal benefit from it. An EIP assistant teacher pointed to one facet in particular which NCCU and Duke "both missed out on . . . they missed the chance to see important changes in the process of teacher training." He was referring to the noncertified assistant teachers and aides who took meaningful skills and inspiration to their jobs with children without benefit of state certification.

J. <u>As distinct from services provided, did EIP generate any relevant and useful by-products and spin-offs</u>? Indeed yes, if we are to accept the information and testimony of a number of interviewees. A few of these were from agencies for which spin-off effects had been anticipated in the original proposal, but there were many others as well.

Appendix 4 lists these by-products and they will be annotated here.

1. Lakewood School (Durham) benefited from example, training, consultation, and observation in setting up its own nongraded primary in 1969-70.

The staff is ready to continue the program and indicated to the superintendent in June, by consensus, that they wish to extend it to cover grades 1 through 6.

2. Durham High School food services vocational program (CHEF), intended for disadvantaged youngsters, is a direct outgrowth of EIP's youth program. It began at the junior high level, and a formal pilot year in 1968, and then was taken over by the city schools under a Title III grant. EIP is credited with providing the impetus as well as some needed development funds.
3. Greene County (N. C.) ESEA Preschool owes much of its existence to EIP staff who first assisted extensively with the proposal, then trained teachers in Durham, and otherwise consulted at minimal cost.
4. The Individualized Mathematics Program of RECLV received particular help in that EIP first suggested the remodeling of the math program, then assisted by providing space, schools for pilot work, proposal outlines, and training.
5. Aiken (S.C.) Title I Preschool personnel visited EIP on repeated occasions and EIP staff consulted there on preschool development and organization. They give credit for many primary ideas and much moral support.
6. NCCU teacher training at elementary school level. This 1970 program has benefited from example, inspiration, and consulting assistance, but will not have the opportunity of observing and studying at EIP sites.
7. Durham County Follow-Through's original proposal was written by EIP staff, who saw a chance to have control subjects and a program replication. Much consulting was provided and assistance given in testing,

interpreting EIP's tests, observing, and so on. "EIP played a vital role in the formulation of FT here" said the director; the research coordinator added that EIP had helped in casework, implementation of behavior-modification techniques, and in providing a model for more productive teaching.

8. The Cooperative School for Pregnant Girls (Durham) is now a Title III agency serving city and county. It is an immediate outgrowth of EIP's youth program and potential parents program, and provides education for girls before and after delivery. In 1970 twelve girls received high school diplomas. EIP assisted in time and money, and in releasing staff to work in the new school; it also worked toward using the facility for useful research in connection with EIP's Infant Project. There has been some community opposition, but more than that, cooperation; the School Board and Board of Health operate the facility now, with the help of some clubs and supportive news coverage.

At present a proposal is being written with Duke's Child Guidance Clinic to support a day care center next year at Southside for the children of girls who must work; at the same time, the children would be available for study and for other health services. In the view of many, the Cooperative School (and its service and potential) is the best testament in the area to EIP's positive impact. (See note below)**

**If the plans for the coming year materialize, the Cooperative School will be serving the parent and infant ends of the poverty spectrum and may develop into a fuller educational program for both ends: in effect a limited but very real reincarnation of original EIP purposes.

9. The Raleigh City Schools' elementary division sent staff to visit the Laboratory School more than once. As a result, "we were very much influenced by their radical ideas . . . and they shock some people into new and better thinking." They set up their own version of the Laboratory School as a demonstration center and will move in 1970-71 to nongraded programs in all schools. They have also begun parent conference techniques gained from EIP and consider them a successful venture.
10. One Durham County school was an EIP target school (Target Area C). On EIP example, the staff developed a full nongraded program in 1968. EIP assisted in many ways. It was a program of which the county system was proud, of which the principal was the prime mover, and of which EIP could say, "This was an excellent program and a wonderful though unanticipated spillover from our original efforts."
11. Alamance County schools sent a scouting team to EIP which was followed by 5 visits from principal, teachers, parents, caretakers, and secretary from one school. They were responsive to the curriculum, discipline procedures, and non-certified teaching staff; they modified their original plans extensively after being touched by EIP. They felt informed, impressed, and inspired. "As others visit us, we will give credit to EIP for many of our practices in the ungraded program and preschool."
12. The N. C. demonstration centers for kindergartens and primary blocks benefited in 2 ways: staff from the state department visited and consulted several times and took teachers and principals with them; staff and EIP personnel interacted on the Governor's Commission in setting up original plans for the 2 programs.
13. The proposal for a continued Infant Project is discussed in item 8 above.

14. One of the most noted EIP developments has been the CITY--a large learning center around which academic and social learning has taken place. It has caused much comment, but so far as we can tell only one school system has taken it into practice; Lynchburg (Va.) schools plan to operate a CITY this year.

15. As reported earlier, one junior high school developed a sex education course as an outgrowth of certain facets of the EIP youth program. The course continues at that school with assistance from medical professionals.

IV. Dimensions of Impact

The foregoing listing of sources (questionnaire, interviews, records, and publications), along with a number of interpretive comments, already indicates something of the nature and extent of EIP's impact on the school systems of Durham, the community at large, and the region. There have been many evidences of a wide range of positive impacts (and a few negative effects), but some further interpretation is called for in order to relate these impacts to EIP's purposes and to look at them in terms of various dimensions. To be sure, the data speak for themselves (number of visits, for example, or the nature of news coverage or the reactions of a sample of parents) separately; in addition, it will help derive further meaning if we search out relationships among the multiple sources employed.

As indicated previously, EIP's various goals and activities centered around two basic objectives: to develop a model school system as a continuing part of the city and county systems, and to markedly affect the education and socialization of a number of impoverished children in the area. In addition, a large number of related expectations and by-products in the school, community, and state were enumerated as feasible of accomplishment.

Inherent in this set of purposes was the goal that EIP have a real and lasting impact, and in fact this was stated in the original proposal (p. 19):

> The success of the five year plan for an educational improvement project in Durham will depend on the right balance between what is required, how soon it can be provided, and how well the community can absorb and utilize it after the experimental period is over.

In the next year or two it is possible that there might be evidence of the adoption by the school systems of the elements of the model school system. At this time, however, it appears that at the one city and one county school where the nongraded plan and some attendant instructional changes took firm hold in the past two years, these programs will not be continued. The only other notable evidence of the model system is the Cooperative School for Girls with its present attempt to relate its program to teen-age girls and infants and to engage in some continuing research. This School is now an agency of the city school system but serves the county as well.

There are several other residues and traces apparent--which will be listed again in summary--but in looking at any suggestions of impact, one wonders which will be accepted. What are the satisfactory criteria of impact if the major goal of adoption and absorption of the educational program has not been attained? Institutional action taken as a result of the program would seem to have meaning, even if the action is of short duration. Or the existence of a number of by-products initiated or inspired by the program should indicate satisfactory impact. Similarly, if there are evidences that attitudes (toward teaching, learning, disadvantagement, race relations, and discipline, for example) are in the process of favorable change, this would appear to be relevant to impact. To a degree, the program's services and dissemination efforts may constitute an acceptable criterion, if they were repeated, extensive, and related to other educational ventures. Even

a group of subtle effects on the convictions and intentions of individuals might suggest a meaningful outcome of the program if one gets the sense that people will act on these convictions. Again, educators' and parents' broad awareness and acceptance of a program, along with its procedures, goals, and apparent effects on children may indicate a satisfactory degree of meaningful impact. Finally, one might consider the program's records concerning observations, visits, publications, numbers of children and teachers involved, and press coverage as a useful indication of program impact.

All these criteria have been applied in this study, and EIP has not been found wanting. Whether or not one accepts the implied hierarchy of criterion sorts of impact outlined above, it is quite clear that on all counts there have been favorable indications of the positive effects of the Durham EIP. Perhaps the fact that there are multiple indications--each one viable in itself--is important in positive conclusions concerning impact, even though one concedes that the major hoped-for outcome is absent. Considering some of the circumstances surrounding the EIP venture (as outlined in part II), and considering that EIP represented something new and different and perhaps unsettling to the Durham area even after 2 or 3 years, it is not surprising that all of EIP's features have not been adopted. But its impact, it seems clear, is both undeniable and extensive. It remains for the individual to decide whether that impact is sufficient.

POSITIVE INDICATIONS. Based on all sources employed, but relying heavily on interview material, the following positive aspects of impact are summarized.

Institutional Action Taken: In the school systems, two schools developed one-year ungraded primary programs, one junior school developed a sex education course, classroom discipline techniques were changed in one school and one program, the

CHEF program was initiated, and the Cooperative School for Girls was planned and implemented.

Other By-Products: One system has adapted THE CITY, one program has used STARS and CASES, 4 locations indicated plans to apply behavior-modification techniques, numerous programs have applied in some way EIP examples of curriculum and method (team teaching, experience method, individualized instruction, cross-age-grouping), 4 locations approved and expected to make use of non-certified personnel (aides, assistant teachers, MAT internes), 5 programs adopted EIP preschool practices, and 3 programs adopted EIP ungraded practices (the latter two categories including programs across the state). In addition, 2 active educational programs benefited from direct impetus provided by EIP staff.

Attitude Effects: There have been many indications of positive attitude changes concerning teaching-learning, race relations and school integration, and classroom techniques particularly related to nongraded programs.

Services and Dissemination: EIP produced several publications aimed at dissemination and a number of journal research reports; many speeches were delivered and articles prepared; an exhibit was shown in several locations; 2 tests were developed, as were a number of curriculum guides, and seminars were conducted for local professionals. In the domain of service, EIP provided cooperative social service with other local agencies, trained teachers and educational testers, wrote proposals and brochures for others, left materials and equipment in target schools, provided the Insturctional Materials Center, consulted widely on educational planning, provided facilities for visits and observations, conducted workshops, gave test result feedback to the school systems, and demonstrated and consulted in local as well as distant schools.

Individuals: Many persons--particularly teachers and principals--indicated their intents and convictions concerning plans to "make a difference" as an individual in the education of children and in the implementation of up-to-date techniques. Local administrative personnel suggested that they are relying on these individuals to carry the benefits of EIP into the schools. Among teachers and principals were many who were indeed intense about their hopes and plans.

Awareness and Acceptance: The majority of persons (interviews, records, and questionnaire) revealed awareness of at least key features of EIP and broad approval of its projects and goals. Parental attitudes were overwhelmingly favorable concerning academic, social, and personal benefits to their children, and by and large local school people had the same sentiments. Also, many parents "participated" in the EIP programs for their children.

Records: EIP's records of visits made and requests for publications suggest that a good deal of interest was generated (and repeat visits suggest more direct impact); the majority of public school visits were not from the local systems, as indicated in the records. A large number of individual children were involved in EIP projects, many of them intensively over 3 or 4 years. Records also report a large press coverage, particularly in the second and third program years, on research activities and program purposes.

NEGATIVE INDICATIONS: These do not fall neatly into the classification scheme used above, and so are listed separately.

1. The Youth Program, active for 2 years, was disbanded for reasons of program difficulties of lack of participation. (Ironically, the Youth Program is credited with providing the impetus behind 3 active programs in the schools and community: food services vocational program, the Cooperative School, and the sex education course at one junior school).

2. Parents expressed negative concerns about difficulties of children's transition into regular system schools.

3. Parents, teachers, and principals expressed negative views about the discipline problems of EIP graduates in regular system schools, and about the academic preparation of some children.

4. Several teachers and principals remarked on the undue classroom time taken for testing EIP subjects and controls in regular system schools.

5. A few persons felt that EIP stressed research to the detriment of attention to the personal and academic needs of children, and program needs of schools.

PROBLEMS REPORTED OR INFERRED. A number of conditions are enumerated which may explain lack of particular or more extensive positive impact and favorable reaction. First, most persons were unaware of the total EIP program and the intended model school system; a concomitant of this was that many failed to see the positive social and educational implications of EIP's presence in the community. Second, EIP's program efforts--under existing local conditions--almost inevitably evoked resistance at the race-relations level and the philosophy-of-education level. Through time, these dissonances have diminished, but it appears that "newer approaches to education and children" have been adopted only minimally thus far. Third, it has not been possible to do much follow-up on non-graded subjects; at least, this is the perception of many respondents who felt that children need to be followed for 2 or 3 more years. Fourth, press coverage appeared not to be "community-oriented," but rather focused on research and projected plans. In this connection, several persons felt that EIP did not make extensive efforts to involve community action groups in planning and program impelementation.

Fifth, there was a widely-held reaction that EIP had tried to do "too much," some EIP senior staff felt the program was diffuse and sometimes fragmented, and acknowledged that outsiders saw EIP as a scattering of programs and places rather than as a coherent whole. This is related, too, to confusion and expectations regarding EIP's emphasis: was it research-centered? a demonstration project? a service agency? or all of these? There was a tendency on the part of many persons to view EIP primarily as a community agency which would provide service, advise, and solve problems; and this view had its impact on EIP impact. Sixth, as discussed earlier, there existed a lack of communication and articulation between EIP and the school systems, and this was recognized by all parties concerned. Related to this, some felt that dissemination was weak in the community at large.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

Impact can be viewed, also, in terms of several other dimensions. For example, in the present case, there appears to have been as much general impact (as defined by the seven categories treated earlier) at distant points as in the immediate city and county. Similarly, impact both local and distant seems to be more of a transitory than a permanent sort, with a few exceptions. Again, it looks as though individuals were affected more than agencies or organizations. In another comparison, awareness and approval appear to outweigh action taken in response to EIP's programs. Clearly, positive impact (by whatever index) has been much greater than the negative. It would appear that intended and unanticipated sorts of impact have come out about even. One might also venture that actual impact has been perhaps half of the potential inherent in EIP. And it also appears that teachers have been more affected by EIP projects than have school administrators. These are of course broad generalizations based on the

sources of information consulted, but they do provide an additional way of looking at the nature and extent of the impact of the Durham Education Improvement Program.

71/72

ETS APPENDIX 1

ETS APPENDIX 1

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE
Mutual Plaza - Durham, North Carolina

The Durham Education Improvement Program is a project of the Ford Foundation under the auspices of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. It has been jointly administered by Duke University, North Carolina Central University, Durham City Schools, Durham County Schools, and Operation Breakthrough, Inc., 1965-70.

Educational Testing Service has been asked to assist the Durham EIP determine some of its effects during the past 5 years on various educational programs in this vicinity. With the approval of the school administrations, we are asking that you complete this very brief survey as an initial step in the project. Your assistance is much appreciated, and it will help indicate various ways in which EIP has been associated with local educational efforts. Please complete the form today, and return it to the principal's office; we will pick it up at the end of the day. Thank you.

1. SCHOOL:_____

2. POSITION: (check one)
___Supervisor (of_____)
___Teacher (of grade(s)_____)
or subject_____)
___Other_____
___Principal
___Asst. Principal
___Librarian
___Consultant/Specialist

	YES	NO
3. Have you heard of the Durham EIP? . . . . . 3.		
4. Did you know it was a set of projects to study and aid education generally in this area? . . . . . 4.		
5. Have you heard other teachers (in this or any other school) talk about EIP projects or the "model system?" . . . . . 5.		
6. Have you visited Southside School? . . . . . 6.		
If not, have you heard about it? . . . . . .6a.		
Have you considered visiting it and its EIP projects? . . . . . .6b.		
7. Have you visited the ungraded primary in any of these schools? Pearson? Edgemont? Lakeview?. . . . . 7.		
If not, have you heard about these ungraded primaries? . . . . . .7a.		
8. Have you been aware of EIP for other reasons than the above? . . . 8. Please specify:_____		
9. From your acquaintance with EIP, do you feel it has served useful functions in the community and schools? . . . . . 9.		
Should various EIP projects be continued, do you feel? . . . . . .9a. Which?_____		
10. Have you attended summer or school-year workshops directed by any of the following persons and concerned with language, reading, methods and materials, speech or speech therapy? . . . . 10. (Dr. Golden, Dr. Anastasiow, Mrs. Taylor, Mrs. Cooper, Mrs. Shenkman)		
Did you associate the workshop(s) with the Durham EIP? . . . . . 10a.		
Did you feel the workshop(s) should be continued or repeated? . . 10b.		

11. Check those you have heard of:
___FEAST
___EIP Lab School
___Model System
___Durham Follow-Through
___EIP Youth Center
___IMS
___Cooperative School for Girls
___EIP Youth Program
___EIP Preschool project
___EIP infant project
___"Educators in Action"
___EIP Instructional Materials Center

12. Other comments (or questions):_____

ETS APPENDIX 2

PERSONAL INTERVIEWS*

Durham County School System:

(EIP) Target Area C School--principal, EIP teacher, EIP assistant teacher
Holt--principal
Parkwood--principal
Bragtown--4 teachers
Mangum--principal, 2 teachers, librarian

Superintendent
Assistant Superintendent
Director of Elementary Education
Elementary Supervisor

Durham City School System:

Crest--principal
Walltown--principal
Burton--principal
(EIP) Target Area B School--principal, EIP teacher
Lakewood--principal
(EIP) Laboratory School--2 EIP teachers, 2 EIP assistant teachers
E. K. Powe--principal
Whitted (junior high)--principal
(EIP) Target Area A School--principal, 1 EIP teacher, 1 teacher

Superintendent
Associate Superintendent
Director of Elementary Education
Director of Vocational Education

Agencies and Parents

9 parents of EIP children
Former EIP school psychologist
Operation Breakthrough--executive director
The Cooperative School for Pregnant Girls--director
Immaculata School (private)--principal
Ford Scholar (Leadership Training Program visitor)
Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia--president
Individualized Mathematics System (RELVC)--acting director, editor
Duke University--head of education department, professor of education
North Carolina Central University--head of education department, former head of education department, professor of education
Learning Institute of North Carolina--director, director of early childhood program, 2 program associates
Operation Follow-Through--director, research coordinator

Current EIP staff:

Director
Administrative Assistant to the Director
Director of Social Services
Director of Curriculum
Coordinator for Research and Evaluation
Director of Information Services

---

*See NOTES at bottom of following page.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS*

County School System:
Bragtown--principal

City School System:
Lakewood--teacher
Elementary Supervisor
H. S. guidance counselor

Agencies and Parents
Parent of EIP child
EIP--former assistant program director, former director of Youth Program, former assistant director of Youth Program, former operations assistant
Duke University--2 physicians formerly with EIP infant project
North Carolina Central University--member of NCCU community advisory committee
The Cooperative School for Pregnant Girls--part-time teacher
Chapel Hill Schools--former coordinator for development
Greene County Schools--director of ESEA Preschool
Alamance County Schools--superintendent, principal of Saxapahaw School
N. C. Department of Public Instruction--director of elementary education
Aiken (S. C.) City Schools--director of federal programs
Raleigh Schools--assistant superintendent for elementary education
ETS (N. J.)--coordinator for Sesame Street evaluation operations

*NOTES:
1. The six members of the EIP Coordinating Committees are listed among the Personal Interviews, in terms of their full-time positions.
2. All personal interviews were conducted in Durham and Durham County.
3. Whether personal or telephone, those listed as former EIP personnel are now in responsible positions concerned with education or public affairs, broadly; however, they were contacted because of their former EIP associations.
4. A number of those contacted served on the EIP Operations Committee.
5. All interviews are listed, whether concerned with EIP activities directly or with by-products and spin-offs.

Transcripts of "EIP Seminars on Disadvantaged Children and Youth," 1967-1968.

File of newspaper articles, 1964-1969 (total number--88); 1 feature article, 1970.

Minutes of Coordinating Committee meetings, September 1965 through February 1970.

File of written requests for EIP publications and/or appointments to visit EIP, 1965-1970 (total number--160).

Record of visits made, 1965-1970 (total number--390).

Records of pupil enrollment, 1965-1970, (total number--278).

First Annual Report
The Durham Education Improvement Program: 1965-66.
Second Annual Report
The Durham Education Improvement Program, 1966-1967.
The Durham Education Improvement Program, Research, 1966-1967.
Third Annual Report
Report to the Coordinating Committee of Durham EIP, 1967-1968.
Final Report (preliminary draft), 1970:, Volume I Educational Intervention in Early Childhood, Chapters 1, 2.
Volume III Abstracts of the 1965-1970 Special Studies Research and Evaluation Reports, (annotated bibliography).

RESOURCES AND PUBLICATIONS*

A Proposal to the Ford Foundation for Support of an Education Improvement Project for Culturally Deprived Children in the Public Schools of Durham City and County, North Carolina, 1965.

Letter from Lakewood parents to city school board (petitioning to retain ungraded primary), June, 1970.

Letters to Greene County concerning preschool teacher training (1968).

Durham County school personnel brochure (1968).

For EIP Parents, Vol. I: January, 1966; No. 9, April 12, 1967. Ed., Bonnie Powell.

Pulling up Parents: A Discussion by member of an EIP Mothers' Club, May 1968, (Mrs. Paula Wallach, social worker and moderator).

Fact Sheet for EIP Families (Pamphlet giving information about EIP and requesting names of children who might be eligible).

The Cooperative School for Pregnant School Girls, (descriptive pamphlet).

Educators in Action, Vol. II: No. 1, September 25, 1967; No. 2, October 31, 1967; No. 3, November-December, 1967; No. 5, February, 1968; No. 6, April, 1968. Ed., Joan First. Published jointly by EIP, Learning Institute of North Carolina, Regional Education Laboratory for the Carolinas and Virginia, Operation Breakthrough, and Durham County Schools.

The House at Lakeview, by students at Lakeview EIP ungraded primary. Ed., D. Friedlein, 1966-1967.

Director of Community Services (Inter-Agency Forum), 1970.

---

*A number of specific research reports and general EIP program descriptions were also read; they served as background and are not cited here.

Individualized Mathematics System, draft proposal for RELCV, A Preliminary Plan for Contemporary Development of Elementary School Math Programs with IPI. (1968).

Durham Follow-Through, A Proposal for Durham County Follow-Through Program. (1967).

Johnson, Lillie Jean (Ford scholar). Durham, North Carolina Report, prepared for Ford Foundation, 1970.

Poole, Claudia (Ford scholar). Narrative Report and Inventory, prepared for Ford Foundation, 1969.

Written report by school superintendent (California) after visit to EIP, May 1970.

"The Durham EIP--Opinions Differ" in Today's Education, February 1969.

BY-PRODUCTS AND SPIN-OFFS* ETS APPENDIX 4

Lakewood School (Durham) ungraded primary, 1969-70
Durham High School Food services vocational program, 1968-70
Greene County ESEA Preschool, 1968-70
Individualized Mathematics System (RELCV), 1968-70
Aiken (S. C.) Title I preschool, 1966-67
North Carolina Central University, teacher-training at elementary school level, 1968-70
Durham County Follow-Through, 1967, 1969-70
Cooperative School for Pregnant Girls (Durham), 1968-70
Raleigh City Schools ungraded primary program, 1968-71
Lakeview School (Durham County) ungraded primary, 1968-69
Alamance County Schools, ungraded primary, 1970-71
N. C. demonstration centers for kindergartens and ungraded K-3, 1969-71
Proposal for continued infant project (Cooperative School and Duke Medical School), 1970

---

*Represented here are continuing programs or those in last stages of development which have been aided by EIP in the following ways: assistance in proposal writing, teacher-training, initiation of program ideas, or various degrees of financial support. Several of these organized efforts have taken and used the example set by EIP projects, particularly in ungraded primary programs.

A number of other schools, persons, and agencies credit EIP with positive influence on their plans or programs, but are not considered to represent by-products or ripple effects. These are discussed in the body of the report.

PRELIMINARY SURVEY RESPONDENTS

Durham County Schools:
- Parkwood--14 teachers, counselor, librarian, principal
- Mangum--10 teachers, librarian, principal
- Holt--principal
- Lakeview--teacher
- Bragtown--2 teachers
- Follow-Through coordinator
- County school supervisor
- County director of elementary education

Durham City Schools:
- Burton--7 teachers
- Crest--3 teachers, principal
- Walltown--8 teachers, librarian, principal
- City director of elementary education

Appendix D

A Report of a Site Visit to the Durham EIP

Appendix D

A Report of a Site Visit to the Durham EIP
by Dr. Charles Knight, Superintendent,
Cupertino School District, Cupertino, California

This report is the result of a visit to the Durham EIP on May 18, 19, and 20, 1970. The author of this report was invited as an outside observer with some background in education to make a rather detailed observation of the program. I am particularly interested in the possibilities of using practices and techniques similar to those developed in Durham in other settings. In San Jose, California where I will be working after July 1, 1970, there is a large population of Mexican-American children who occupy a position similar to the black child in Durham in that they are often excluded from participation in the larger society not only because of race or cultural background, but, also because of rather extreme educational deprivation.

It is the intent of this report to explore the program as it was observed, to express opinions of practices and procedures seen there, and express an opinion regarding the usefulness of such a program in other settings. Since the major thrust of the program is in the direction of people rather than things, this report will not involve itself, except incidentally, with the materials of instruction.

What is the Education Improvement Program? According to a statement by Dr. Robert Spaulding in the 1966-67 report of the EIP, "The Durham EIP seeks to transform the school environment to suit these developmental needs of disadvantaged children." He states further, "EIP has taken the position that the most powerful force for promoting change in the school setting is the warm, personal attention of the teacher. The second most important feature of EIP's classes is the presentation of structured, concrete environments which invite exploration, language, and thought. By the appropriate use of adult attention, the withholding

of attention, and proper pacing and sequencing of concrete experiences, it is hypothesized disadvantaged children will develop the social and intellectual characteristics valued in modern technological America."

In this report we will attempt to determine whether or not progress has been made toward these goals.

The EIP is set in Durham, North Carolina. In many respects Durham is a typical southern town, in spite of the fact that it is the location of a major university. Black pupils have customarily found themselves in situations in the community and in the schools where they must take second best or nothing at all in their efforts to survive. The result is a major segment of the black community living in poverty both economically and educationally.

In recent years a black middle class has been developing. The growth of the Research Triangle industrial area with its many national companies is bringing with it numbers of black people who work in technical, professional and managerial positions and who will add a great number to the small black middle class that already exists in Durham. Nevertheless, for the time being, the largest number of Negroes in the area falls into what has come to be called the disadvantaged or poverty group. It is the children of this group who make up the major segment of those involved in EIP. There are a number of white children from poverty backgrounds, and three children of staff members, both black and white.

All children, except those of staff members, come from target areas of Durham and one rural school area. Children from birth to early teens have been involved. The infant study has followed children from birth to their present age of four or five years. Pre-school and primary age children have been participating in three public schools and the laboratory school. The

youth group, seventh graders ranging in age from 11 to 15, totalled 40. Parents were involved through the school social services phase of the program. This included numerous home visits and social service support given the family as required in order to keep the children in school and in the program. Parent involvement included such activities as attendance at information meetings, help with children's speech training, and participating in health education programs.

All of this activity and involvement resulted in the program observed during the visit of May 1970.

Brief observations were made of the nursery and other classes at W. G. Pearson School. A visit was made to the class at Edgemont School. Since these classes are operating in a typical public school setting they do not represent the "pure" use of the various experimental processes to be found in the laboratory situation at Southside School. The classes in regular schools are operating in a self-contained situation without the benefit of the large spaces and flexibility available at Southside. The teachers of these classes have used the techniques developed by EIP to the extent they were able to understand the circumstances. These classes appear to have resulted in much greater student interest and participation in school activities than is customarily expected of children in the usual Durham classrooms.

The Program at Southside School

Southside is a school that was no longer used by the Durham Public School System. For purposes of the study it provided spacious quarters for both children and a rather extensive research and support staff. At the present time there are about 30 children in the two groups at Southside. Included are 10 children who would be classified as retarded in a regular public school.

The school day starts with a planning session in each class. Each child plans his day. In making out the basic plan form for each child, the teacher has planned for the number of 20-minute periods he will be in one guided activity or another. As each child is ready, the teacher leaves one or more periods blank for the child to make his own decision about. Thus, as a child develops competence in self discipline he is given the opportunity to plan how he will use additional "free" or unassigned periods.

During the daily planning period the child and teacher negotiate an agreement about what the pupil will attempt to do during each period. Since some of the periods involve other teachers or aides the child must often reach agreement with them about the tasks to be accomplished when he arrives at one of the centers to work.

Work is planned in the usual academic skill subjects of language development and arithmetic. In addition the children may explore in the Media Center, Science Lab, Shop and Graphics, Cooking and Sewing, and the "City." There is considerable freedom to talk during the planning period, and there is discussion with the teacher and classmates regarding the day's plans. Because each teacher has a different approach to the planning process each class is slightly different in the way the process is handled. But in both cases there is an open feeling of involvement obvious on the part of the children.

The media center, the shop and the cooking and sewing centers are more or less typical of these types of facilities. The science center, in addition to the usual accoutrements of a primary science unit, has a small zoo. There are gerbils, mice, rabbits, snakes, fish, squirrels, and a monkey. The children learn to handle the furry animals. They feed and take care of all the animals. The measurement of feed, growth, and other changes in the animals is part of the

study. The unusual aspect of the situation is that these specialized areas are being used at Southside by pre-school and primary age children rather than the usual upper graders or junior high age pupils.

A most unique concept is that of the "City." Children of poverty have little opportunity or inclination because of their setting to explore the world beyond their own home and the street in front of it. Although they have seen many things from the outer world on television, they have difficulty relating them to their own reality. The "City" gives each child an opportunity to experience through dramatic play the various roles people play to make the life of the city go forward.

There is a full-scale play period in the "City" once a week. It is preceded by a planning period in which all children are involved. During this session assignments are worked out, and each assignment is discussed and the activities involved in each work role are clarified. Each child eventually has an opportunity to play each role and learn something of the expectations involved for that role.

After the play period there is an evaluation session with all the children, teachers, and aides taking an active part. It is here that questions are answered and if an answer isn't known by anyone present, a real outside authority is invited in to answer it. In this way the children have met a real mayor, policemen, firemen, nurses, doctors, airline pilots, and many, many more. In this way, too, the "City" has grown.

The "City" started with only one or two activity centers. As questions were raised in these centers about things that go on in a real city, the children felt the need to create additional centers so that other roles could be explored. Thus, from a home center, questions were raised about how a store would run, then to the problem of cars and how they are regulated, and on to hospitals,

fire department, police department, airport, bank, restaurant, airplane, space ship, school, and sewing shop. As each of these activities was added it was the subject of study and planning by the children until the new center was completed. As a result, the children appear to have an excellent understanding of the way a city works. From their study, visits, and play sessions they have broadened their horizons way beyond the street in front of their houses.

The teaching technique used in the "City" is a good example of an application of the discovery method. Dr. Spaulding is a strong advocate of this approach to helping children learn. The development of the "City" and broadening the process of role development illustrate a most effective use of this approach. As part of the staff training program Dr. Spaulding has encouraged teachers to use the discovery method in every subject or activity where it would be appropriate and effective.

There is no single instructional program for any subject. In reading several commercial programs are used. The same is true in mathematics. All of the purchased programs utilize the discovery approach as a way to get the children involved in the learning process. The teachers are free to improvise and adapt as the needs of the child require. The result is a very fluid situation that gives teachers several choices of material and helps assure the success of each child.

The teaching approaches and the development of positive teacher attitudes are tied in with the development, use and refinements of CASES and STARS. The Coping Analysis Schedule for Educational Settings (CASES) and the Spaulding Teacher Activity Rating Schedule (STARS) are used to assist teachers in analyzing their interactions with pupils. It is the intent of the CASES instrument to, first, understand the child's system of coping with the classroom environment

by identifying the social processes he uses in that setting. STARS "is designed to focus on the overt efforts of teachers to bring about change in the social and cognitive behavior of pupils in the classroom." These two instruments used together result in the teacher, perhaps for the first time, really looking closely at the behavior of children, her own behavior, their interaction, and the resultant behavior patterns that develop in the child.

The overall result of this process is a social situation in the school in which non-essential and unnecessarily restrictive rules have been discarded. The children are much more free to move, interact, talk, and be involved than is usually found in the traditional classroom.

Conclusions

The observer has been active in the field of education for 20 years. As teacher, principal and superintendent, it has been my goal to seek better ways to accomplish the task of the school. During the past seven years as superintendent of schools at Cupertino, California it has been my privilege to observe and work with many individuals who were successfully implementing innovative practices in their schools and classrooms. In fact, the district has become rather well known for innovation. It is with this rather wide experience with the implementation of innovation in new settings that I made the visit to the Durham Education Improvement Program.

My review of the Durham Education Improvement Program did not include any statistical analysis, although Dr. Spaulding did review in considerable detail the results of the many studies carried on in connection with the program. I talked to teachers, aides, children, and administrators in an attempt to understand the feelings of those who were "living" the program. I spent a great part of two days just observing the children in action. The result is a highly personal

evaluation tempered by many years experience in education often spent in making "objective" evaluations.

From experience, observation, research, and reading I have come to the conclusion that the attitude teachers bring to their work is the key element in the success or failure of their pupils. With highly motivated students it becomes less important, but with children who come to school with minimal learning skills the attitude of the teacher toward those children can be devastating if it is not supportive of their efforts.

Directly related to teacher attitude, of course, is the sense of belonging and involvement the pupils in her class may or may not have as a result of their interaction with her. Pupils who feel rejection or negativism from the teacher do not get involved in the school process much less the learning process.

It is in these related areas that the Durham project exhibits its greatest strength. Not only in the rich environment of Southside School, but also in the regular schools of the district where the Program was in action, I observed teachers who cared about their pupils. The behaviors that indicated this were exhibited by both pupils and teachers. Children were at ease, they felt free to ask questions of their teachers (often a rarity in some classrooms), teachers answered questions, they talked to individual children as though they really mattered, they took the time to make elaborate preparation for the day's activities, and they really participated with the children in activities such as the "City" and in the evaluation periods. The results of these behaviors then indicate a commitment and involvement.

The major success of the Program is that it includes a procedure for changing teacher behavior and attitude through the use of CASES and STARS. As a result of the application of these techniques positive pupil attitudes are nurtured and their involvement in the learning process becomes very deep.

Concurrently with the development of this rich emotional environment, teaching techniques have been developed that encourage the pupil to explore the various fields available. He is able to earn greater freedom by exhibiting responsible behavior which in turn leads to more involvement in learning. Pupils who are irresponsible are not punished in the traditional sense, rather their freedom to operate independently is restricted until they again show that they are responsible.

The result of all these related activities is a program that is eminently successful in bringing children into the school sponsored learning process and keeping them there. In addition, I believe, the Program has developed teacher training procedures that can be learned by any teacher willing to try. The procedures can be learned and used in any school setting. They could be most effectively used in inner city schools which often lack the necessary tools the Durham EIP is now able to provide.

In summary, the Durham Education Improvement Program is an effective tool for changing teacher and pupil attitudes, for developing a deep sense of involvement in both pupils and teachers and for establishing in pupils an interest in learning and a feeling that the school is "theirs" in the sense that they belong there. Further, in my opinion, with trained leadership, the program could be implemented anywhere in the country. It would be most effective in core-city areas where schools have had the most difficulty overcoming the habit of failure.

Perhaps the best evaluation of the program may be found in an incident that occurred recently at Southside School. Over several weekends doors of the school were found open on Monday morning. Since they had been locked on Friday a break-in was suspected, but nothing was missing or disturbed. The next weekend a staff member working in a back room heard a noise in the "City" and went to investigate.

There he found a number of children playing just as they would have during the school day. It turned out that they had found their way into the building each weekend to play and had innocently walked out the doors leaving them open. These children come from a neighborhood that places very little value on schools or anything that goes on in a traditional school. Yet, they felt so strongly and innocently that Southside was their school that they were free to go over and play during the weekend. They chose this rather than free play around their own home neighborhood. A real testimony to the success of the Durham Education Improvement Program.

--- Charles Knight
1969 Wimbledon Place
Los Altos, California 94022

Appendix E

List of EIP Consultants

Appendix E

List of EIP Consultants (1965-1970)

Research

Dr. Nancy Bayley
Institute of Human Development
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. John S. Bell
Umstead State Hospital
Butner, North Carolina

Dr. E. Kuno Beller
Department of Psychology
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Dr. Jay Birnbrauer
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Lloyd J. Borstelmann
Department of Medical Psychology
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Gerald W. Bracey
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Dr. David Brison
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Toronto
Ontario, Canada

Mr. Edward Bruchak
Regional Education Laboratory for
the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. John Burchard
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Earl C. Butterfield
Department of Psychology
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut

Dr. Bettye Caldwell
Director, Children's Center
Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Mr. T. Jeffrey Cartier
Regional Education Laboratory
for the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Miriam Clifford
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Rue L. Cromwell
Department of Psychiatry
School of Medicine
Vanderbilt University
Nashville, Tennessee

Mr. James Dobbins
Regional Education Laboratory
for the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Norman Ellis
Department of Psychology
University of Alabama
University, Alabama

Dr. Frank Emmerling
Regional Education Laboratory
for the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Marilyn Erikson
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mr. James R. Fortune, Sr.
Duke University Medical Center
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. James J. Gallagher
Frank Porter Graham Child
Development Center
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Frederic L. Girardeau
Bureau of Child Research Laboratories
Children's Rehabilitation Unit
University of Kansas Medical Center
Kansas City, Kansas

Mr. Jackson Glasgow
WTVD-TV
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Herbert Grossman, Director
Illinois State Pediatric Research Institute
Chicago, Illinois

Dr. Robert Hale
Department of Pediatrics
Duke University Medical Center
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Florence Harris
Director, Preschool Laboratory
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

Dr. Christoph M. Heinicke
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Mr. John Herrin
WTVD-TV
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. William G. Hollister
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Nancy Johnson
Developmental Evaluation Clinic
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. William G. Katzenmeyer
Department of Education
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Donald N. McIsaac, Jr.
School of Education
University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin

Mrs. Anne S. Miller
Regional Education Laboratory for
the Carolinas and Virginia
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. K. P. Murphy
Reading, Yorkshire
England, G.B.

Mrs. Susan Stolte
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. B. G. Tate
Department of Psychology
University of Mississippi
Oxford, Mississippi

Dr. Patricia Waller
Department of Psychology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mrs. Patricia G. Webbink
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Teacher Training

Mrs. Genevieve Bondurant
Palo Alto Unified Schools
Palo Alto, California

Mrs. Georgia Cooper
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mrs. Ellen Day
Elon College, North Carolina

Mr. James McDowell
Long View School
Davis, California

Mrs. Betty W. Price
Formerly at Stanford University
Stanford, California

Dr. Thomas Price
School of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mrs. Nancy K. Weeks
Palo Alto, California

Miss Jane B. Wilson
Director of Libraries
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. Robert Young
Roemer Young Associates, Inc.
New York, New York

Education

Dr. Nicholas J. Anastasiow, Director
Institute for Child Study
University Schools
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Mr. Ralph Bohrson
Program Officer
Division of Education and Research
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

Mr. Herman A. Breithaupt
Culinary Arts Program
Schoolcraft Community College
Livonia, Michigan

Mr. Frank G. Burnett, Principal
W. G. Pearson School
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Hobert Burns, Acting President
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

Mrs. Frances S. Clemons, Principal
Lakeview School
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Paul Clifford, Consultant
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

Mrs. Camille Cunningham, Teacher
Edgemont School
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Florence C. Dickerson
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Mary Frasier
Operation Breakthrough, Inc.
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Caleb Gattegno
Schools for the Future
New York, New York

Dr. Loretta Golden
Nueva School
Menlo Park, California

Dr. Herbert Goldstein
Department of Education
Yeshiva University
New York, New York

Dr. Susan Gray
The John F. Kennedy Center for Research
on Education and Human Development
George Peabody College
Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Dorothea Hinman
Schools for the Future
New York, New York

Mrs. Hazel F. Jackson
Director, Elementary Education
Durham County Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Jean Johnson, Artist
Durham, North Carolina

Dr. Charles Knight
Superintendent
Cupertino School District
Cupertino, California

Mrs. Jenovefa Kurz
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Joseph I. Lipson
Nova University
Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Mrs. Ruth L. McRackan
Director, Elementary Education
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Nancy Messer
Storrs, Connecticut

Dr. Greta Morine
California State College
Hayward, California

Dr. Harold Morine
San Jose State College
San Jose, California

Miss Ethel G. Reade
Supervisor, Elementary Instruction
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. Philip Reidford
The Ontario Institute for
Studies in Education
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Mr. Clyde P. Richman, Principal
E. K. Powe School
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Lola H. Solice
Supervisor, Elementary Instruction
Durham City Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. Harold N. Stinson
Boggs Academy
Keysville, Georgia

Mrs. Lucia F. Taylor
Supervisor, Elementary Education
Durham County Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Appendix E (continued)

Mr. James R. Weldon, Principal
Southside School
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. W. G. Whichard, Principal
E. K. Powe School
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. James Wilson, Science Teacher
Durham County Schools
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Claire Wolf
Los Altos Hills, California

Mr. William M. Woody, Principal
Edgemont School
Durham, North Carolina

Speech and Hearing

Mrs. Ruedi Gingrass
Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Raymond Jones
Speech Therapist
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Carol Kylstra
Speech Therapist
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Mary Jane Morawetz
Speech Therapist
Durham, North Carolina

Social Services

Dr. Maeda Galinsky
School of Social Work
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Administration

Mr. Buck Burke
Auto Evaluator
Burlington, North Carolina

Mrs. W. J. Dollar
Seamstress
Durham, North Carolina

Miss Nell Ellington
Belk Leggett Company
Durham, North Carolina

Mr. Marion Ham, Architect
M. A. Ham Associates, Inc.
Durham, North Carolina

Youth Program

Dr. Charles G. Hurst
Communication Sciences Department
Howard University
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Robert A. Lassiter
School of Education
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Vivian S. Sherman
American Institutes for Research
Palo Alto, California

Mrs. Isabelle B. Westby
Indianapolis, Indiana

Information

Mr. Billy Barnes, Photographer
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Mr. Monty Diamond, Photographer
New York, New York

Dr. Jack Edling, Director
Teaching Research Division
Oregon State System of Higher Education
Monmouth, Oregon

Mrs. Joan D. First
Southwest Center for Early
Childhood Personnel Development
State College of Arkansas
Conway, Arkansas

Mr. Randy Jones
Ad-Art Studio
Durham, North Carolina

Mrs. Bonnie R. Powell, Designer
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dr. Arthur Rice, Jr.
Michigan Education Association
East Lansing, Michigan

Appendix F

Health Conditions and Services in EIP

Appendix F

Health Conditions and Services in EIP

by

Edna Watkins
Duke University

A child who has a hearing loss, impaired vision, aching teech, comes to school hungry or otherwise lacks the stamina of a healthy child has restrictions imposed upon his ability to learn.

The primary objective of the Durham Education Improvement Health Program was to identify and focus our attention to these problems.

These objectives can be described in four categories.

1. To monitor the health of the student population through screening and observation.
2. The exercise of suitable measures for the control of contagious and preventable diseases.
3. Assistance to the child and his family with problems related to health and health education.
4. Assistance to the teaching staff with evaluations of health related problems in the classroom.

Observation of the student population was an on-going program, accomplished by weekly visits to each classroom. These visits were scheduled for each class at a time during the day which would least disrupt the normal class schedule. During these visits, children were free to talk with the nurse about any concern they had. The informality of the setting provided frequent opportunities for individual health education.

The screening procedures were initiated in late September and continued throughout the school year. Each screening procedure was preceded by classroom discussion to familiarize the child with the procedure, the reason for it, and its importance to the child.

The testing measures included the Snellen Eye Test for visual acuity. The Snellen was administered to all children aged four and older. Any child who scored 20/50 or above was referred for additional examination and treatment by a physician. The results of the testing revealed 8% of the students were in need of additional examination. Any child who exhibited other visual problems was observed and referred for examination.

The Ishihara's Test for Colour Blindness was administered to the four-year-olds through the primary groups. The teaching staff was informed of those identified as having a color weakness.

Audiometric testing using the Beltone Audiometer was completed on the student population excluding the two-year-old groups. The initial screening was done by the Education Technicians under the supervision of the Speech and Hearing Specialists. Those who scored below normal limits were retested by the Speech and Hearing Specialist. Hearing problems were negligible.

Height and weight measurements were recorded in October and March of each year. These were compared to the Anthropometric Growth Charts published by the Children's Medical Center, Boston, Massachusetts. Fourteen children had gained less than two pounds and 15 children had grown less than one inch within a five-month period. Only two of this number fell below the median on the Anthropometric Chart.

Dental care was the greatest unmet need among the student population. During the 1968-1969 school year, the dentist employed by the Department of Public Health gave the third grade students in Area C and the Laboratory School cursory dental inspections. Half of these children appeared to need immediate dental care.

Using a Head Start dental fee schedule, a family of five would expect to spend $130 for the recommended semi-annual cleaning, polishing and fluoridation. If each member of the family had an X-ray and one extraction or filling, the fees could amount to an additional $90. These charges are in excess of the amount the average EIP family could spend for all kinds of medical care.

Each year, the children entering the first grade were given physical examinations by their family physicians or at the school by a health department physician. The parent or guardian was notified and encouraged to be present for these examinations. Parental attendance was poor because many parents are employed outside the home. Therefore, it was necessary to visit them when positive findings indicated a need for intervention. Parents were notified by letter when the examination was within normal limits.

It was the responsibility of the Social Service Component to investigate absences. The social worker was notified by the teacher of any absence lasting three days. A call or visit was made to the home to determine the reason for the absence, and to offer assistance when appropriate to maintain school attendance.

Each year the absences for a four-month period, November through February, were analyzed (Tables 1 and 2). For this period in the school year 1966-1967, there were 1,014 absences. 431 or 42% were reported as non-illness absences; 683 or 67% were reported as illness absences.

A breakdown of the types of illnesses revealed: 81% were attributed to respiratory or contagious diseases; 15% were attributed to other illnesses; and 4% were visits to doctor or clinic.

Table 1

Frequency Distributions and Percentages of Absences and Reported Causes of Absences During Three Program Years (1966 - 1969)

Academic Year	No. of Enrolled Pupils	Total No. of Absences	Mean Absences per Pupil	Reported Causes			
				Illness		Non-Illness	
				N	%	N	%
1966-67	129	1014	7.9	683	68	431	42
1967-68	167	854	5.1	624	73	230	27
1968-69	215	1527	7.1	1175	77	352	23

Note. - Data are based on absences reported during four-month (November - February) periods in each of the three academic years.

Table 2

Percentage Distribution of Types of Illness Related Absences

Academic Year	No. of Absences Due to Illness	Respiratory or Contagious		Other Illnesses		Doctor or Dentist Visits	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
1966-67	683	553	81	103	15	27	4
1967-68	624	512	82	75	12	37	6
1968-69	1175	940	80	141	12	94	8

For the same period in the school year 1967-1968, there were 854 absences. 230 or 26% were non-illness absences; 624 or 73% were illness-related absences. 82% of this number were attributed to respiratory or contagious conditions, 12% other illnesses, and 6% to doctor or dentist's visits.

For the school year 1968-1969, there were 1,527 absences for the same four-month period. 352 or 23% were non-illness absences. Three pupils were absent for a total of 59 times before being dropped from the rolls. Social Services hoped to have these children returned after changes had occurred to alter the family situations. Another child was absent 31 days because of family crisis before returning to class. 1,175 or 77% were attributed to illness. The percentages for this year reflected a similar pattern; 80% were attributed to respiratory infections and contagious conditions; 12% were attributed to other illnesses; and 8% to doctor and dentist's appointments.

It would appear that the prompt attention paid to absences and the support provided by social service was responsible for the decline in non-illness absences. This type absence dropped from 42% in 1966-1967 to 23% in 1968-1969.

The completion of an immunization program is of primary importance in the prevention and control of communicable disease.

Immunization records indicate 91% of the student population had received the immunizations required by the statutes of North Carolina for school attendance. A closer analyzation of these records reveals 70% of the student population had completed a program of immunizations, including boosters, appropriate for their age. Only .03% had no record of immunizations.

The alertness of the teaching staff to symptoms of illness made possible the early exclusion of sick children. The emphasis placed on personal hygiene was useful in preventing the spread of contagious conditions.

Health Education was based on the general principles that health teaching should meet the needs and the interests of the children and of their families; that consideration should be given to the sociological, cultural and economic factors which have a bearing upon health behaviors; and that pupils should be given an opportunity commensurate with their levels of maturity to learn through participation in practical problem solving situations.

These principles were employed in individual conferences with pupils and their parents, and in classroom sessions. Each lesson plan included concrete demonstrations in which the children could participate. For the unit on dental care, each child was given a toothbrush kit and the lesson plan included actual tooth brushing. This same demonstration was done for a parent meeting in order to involve parents in some of the experiences of the children.

Because of crowded living conditions and poor sanitation, impetigo was the most prevalent health problem of these families. It was accepted as "fall sores" which occurred annually, and frequently combated with ineffective home remedies. Individual conferences with the child and his parent, classroom teaching related to care and treatment, and printed materials supplied by the local health department were used to introduce approved methods of treatment for this disease. The treatment was effective, simple to administer and inexpensive and won support from the parents. Each year the infections were milder and were more self-limiting.

One day a teacher called to say that a child had bumped her head. The accident was minor; however, the child could not be consoled until the teacher, at the child's repeated request, had "called the nurse." In addition to being a gratifying experience, this occurrence represented the educational importance of demonstrating school health services and more generally school social services.

Appendix G

EIP Survey and Family
Interview Schedules

Appendix G

Fact Sheet for Interviewers

Education Improvement Program and Head Start

We are trying to find out about the children in this area who are five years old and younger. Classes operated by Operation Breakthrough's Head Start Program are available during the summer for children old enough to enter school next year. Classes operated by the Education Improvement Program are available in the fall for 2-year-olds and 5-year-olds.

(Give interpretation according to the interests of the informant and ages of the children. Try to fill the survey sheet whether there is an interest in the program or not.)

The Education Improvement Program has classes during the regular school year. The purpose is to teach children things they can learn at an early age that will help them later in school. The children from Edgemont will be transported either to Southside or Pearson Schools in the afternoons (1:00 to 4:30). Only a certain number can be enrolled and parents will be notified if the child is accepted.

Summer Head Start is an eight-week program from June 20th - August 12th, and held in the mornings from 8:30 - 12:30 at Scarborough Nursery, St. Mark's Nursery, and St. Luke's Kindergarten. Transportation will be provided if needed and arrangements made usually for transportation to the nearest center. A morning snack and mid-day meal will be provided. (See application for more details.)

Area_____

Date_____

Interviewer_____

1. Child's Name_____Age____Sex____Birthdate_____
2. Address_____Phone_____Race_____
3. Mother's Name_____Father in home_____
   separated_____divorced_____widowed_____other_____
4. Siblings:

	Name	Sex	Birthdate	School
1)				
2)				
3)				
4)				
5)				
6)				
7)				
8)				

5. Who else lives in household?_____
   _____
6. Father's Name_____Where does he work?_____
   _____What does he do?_____
7. Who cares for child?_____
8. Is mother working?_____What type of work?_____
   _____What type of work has she done?_____
9. Level of Education: Mother_____Father_____
10. Are you interested in your child participating in the Program?_____
11. Worker: Please comment briefly (on back of sheet) on impressions regarding environment, appearance of home, or anything outstanding about this contact.

Appendix G (continued)

(Revised January 1968)

Social Worker_____

Informant_____

EIP Family Research Schedule

1. Name_____Date_____
2. Sex____Race____Religion____Birthdate____Verified on_____
3. with_____(Birth Certificate or Hospital Record)_____
4. Address (Year):_____
5. Address (Year):_____
6. Emergency contact:_____
7. Relation to child_____Address_____
8. Nearest telephone_____

Family Constellation:

9. Person(s) responsible for EIP child:_____Relation_____
10. Mother_____Age_____Place of Birth_____
11. Last grade completed____Age of completion____Present occupation_____
12. Occupational rating (Warner Scale)____Length of time on job_____
13. Job stability rating_____
14. Marital Status: Married____No. of previous marriages____Separated_____
15. Divorced____Widowed____Never Married____Unknown____
16. Father_____Age____Place of Birth_____
17. Last grade completed____Age of completion____Present occupation_____
18. Occupational rating (Warner Scale)____Length of time on job_____
19. Job stability rating_____
20. Marital Status: Married____No. of previous marriages____Separated_____
21. Divorced____Widowed____Never Married____Unknown____
22. Children (in and out of the home, oldest first):

	Name	Sex	Age	Occupation or School	Birthdate
1)					
2)					
3)					
4)					
5)					
6)					
7)					
8)					

23. Give the names of children behind in grade level:

1)_____Years behind_____

2)_____Years behind_____

3)_____Years behind_____

24. Others in household:

Name	Relation	Age	Sex	Occupation or School and Grade
1)				
2)				
3)				
4)				

Family Income:

	Monthly	Father	Mother	Other	Welfare	Total
25.						
26.						
27.						

28. Social Work estimate of how family manages on income:_____

_____

_____

29. Attitude expressed about income:_____

_____

_____

Housing:

30. Neighborhood: Very good____Good____Fair____Poor____Very Poor____

31. Family Housing Conditions: Very good____Good____Fair____Poor____Very Poor____

32. Housekeeping: Very good____Good____Fair____Poor____Very Poor____

33. Buying Home____Renting____Cost per month____

34. Living with relatives at no cost____Number of Rooms____

35. Type of Housing: Single____Apartment____Public Housing____Other____

36. Year____Type____

37. Year____Type____

38. Year____Type____

39. Home Furnishings: Good____Fair____Poor____

40. Is there an outdoor place for play: At home?____In the neighborhood?____

41. Note presence of the following equipment or materials in the home: Telephone

42. ____T.V.____Radio____Car____Kind of heating unit____Cooking unit____

43. Washing machine ____Iron_____Children's books_____Toys_____Adult books_____

44. Magazines_____Newspapers_____Phonograph_____Other_____

Description of Family Organization:

45. Intact_____Extended_____One parent_____Common-law marriage_____One parent with one or more relatives_____Unknown_____

46. Rate family communication patterns with non-authoritarian individuals and institutions: Excellent_____Good_____Fair_____Poor_____Unknown_____

47. Rate family communication:
Excellent_____Good_____Fair_____Poor_____Unknown_____

48. Rate intra-familial communication patterns:
Excellent_____Good_____Fair_____Poor_____Unknown_____

Indicate your impressions of how the family is managed:

49. a. Father major decision maker_____

50. b. Mother major decision maker_____

51. c. Relative major decision maker_____

d. Shared responsibility by father and mother_____

e. Unknown_____

52. Agencies and institutions involved with the family? Yes___No___

53. Date_____Agency_____Worker_____

54. Date_____Agency_____Worker_____

55. Date_____Agency_____Worker_____

56. Date_____Agency_____Worker_____

58. Check major social contacts for the family: (Describe)

59. Kinship groups, specify and describe_____

_____

60. Neighbors and friends_____

61. Church attendance_____

62. Sunday School for children_____

63. Church activities_____

64. PTA or school activities_____

65. List group memberships:_____

66. Travel:_____

67. Others:_____

68. Are there indications of personal and/or social problems in the family such as:

69. Behavioral or psychiatric symptoms_____

70. Peer relationship problems_____

71. Prison record_____

72. Severe marital conflict_____

73. Continuous loss of employment_____

74. Marked lack of household organization_____

75. Illiteracy_____

76. Other_____ 77._____

78. Describe briefly specific problem(s) of family members that have been identified.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

The Development of the Education Improvement Program child:

79. Mother's pregnancy: Planned__Unplanned__Normal__Complications_____

80. Describe anything mother feels was special about pregnancy and/or birth_____

_____

_____

81. Child's place of birth_____Birth weight___lbs.___oz.

82. Did mother have assistance during her convalescence with care of infant?____

83. Who assisted?_____

84. Note any statements regarding the beginning mother-child relationship_____

_____

_____

85. Father's attitude and relationship_____

_____

86. Other family members_____

_____

87. Who cared for the child in years prior to enrolling in the EIP Program?_____

_____

88. Describe handling and care of child_____

89. Breast fed__Bottle fed__Crying in early infancy__Age taken out of parent's

90. bedroom_____. Does he now have a room of his own?___If he shares, with whom?

91. _____Was child allowed to move freely as an infant?__Kept in play pen?_____.

92. Was talked to___Sung to___Read to___Early toys___Games played_____

93. Walked at_____Began talking: Words_____Sentences_____

94. Toilet training initiated at age____Complete method used____

95. Dry at night____

96. Parents'description of child's personality (Mood, temperament, how parent feels child handles his feelings)_____

97. Would you describe him as having an average amount of dependence?_____

98. Too dependent____Independent____Too independent____

99. How does he handle separations from mother or surrogates?_____

100. Describe sibling relationships_____

101. Describe peer relationships_____

102. Activities: What does he like to do?_____

103. What does he like for you to do with him?_____

104. Does he have chores assigned to him?_____Does he like books?_____

105. Is he read to?____Does child have a schedule for daily activities_____

106. Describe_____

107. Child's Health

Did this child receive well-baby care?____Where?_____How long?_____

108. When was he last seen by a doctor?____Has he ever received a dental examination?____When was the last one?_____

109. History of Health Problems:

Year	Disease or Symptoms	Treatment
____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____
____	_____	_____

110. Has EIP child had immunizations for smallpox____typhoid____red measles____ polio____tetanus____diptheria____Where?_____When?_____

111. Family Health (If all members considered in good health, please indicate)

Name	Condition	Medical Care

112. List social work interventions with family members:

Name_____ Date_____

Intervention

Outcome

Name_____ Date_____

Intervention

Outcome

Name_____ Date_____

Intervention

Outcome

Name_____ Date_____

Intervention

Outcome

Appendix H

Levels of Social Functioning

Appendix H

Levels of Social Functioning*

General Criteria for Levels of Social Functioning

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Community Has a Right to Intervene	Behavior Not Sufficiently Harmful to Justify Intervention	Behavior Is in Line With Community Expectations
Laws and/or mores are clearly violated. Behavior of family members a threat to the community.	No violation of major laws although behavior of family members is contrary to what is acceptable for status group.	Laws are obeyed and mores observed. Behavior acceptable to status group.
Family life is characterized by extreme conflict, neglect, severe deprivation, or very poor relationships resulting in physical and/or emotional suffering of family members; disruption of family life imminent, children in clear and present danger because of conditions above or other behavior inimical to their welfare.	Family life marked by conflict, apathy, or unstable relationships which are a potential threat to welfare of family members and/or the community; each crisis poses the danger of family's disruption, but children are not in imminent danger.	Family life is stable, members have a sense of belonging, family is able to handle problems without facing disruption, children are being raised in an atmosphere conducive to healthy physical and emotional development. Socialization process carried out affirmatively; adequate training in social skills.

A. Family Relationships and Family Unity

1. Marital Relationship

Marital Relationship should be checked where either or both of the following are applicable: (1) one partner has a legal responsibility toward the other and has some contact with the family; (2) there is a continuing extramarital relationship of significance in family functioning.

Check not applicable where above are not present.

---

*Reproduced with permission of the Community Health and Welfare Planning Council, Saint Paul, Minnesota from Understanding the Multi-problem Family by L. L. Geismar and Michael A. LaSorte. New York: Association Press, 1964, pp. 205-222.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Separated partner does not support when so ordered, or is extremely disturbing influence on family.	Separated partner does not support adequately or regularly or is a disturbing influence in family.	Couple lives together.
Extramarital relations are endangering children's welfare, or have come to attention of law.	Extramarital relations exist but do not openly affect welfare of children.	Extramarital relations, if present at all, are minimal and transitory, and have not been allowed to jeopardize family solidarity.
Emotional tie is so deficient that children are endangered.	Weak emotional tie between partners, lack of concern for each other.	Positive emotional tie between partners who can express need for the other's help and respond appropriately to need. Considerable pleasure derived from shared experiences.
Severe, persistent marital conflict, necessitating intervention by authorities or threatening complete disruption of family life.	There are some points of agreement between parents, but disagreement and conflict tend to predominate and obscure them.	Consistent effort to limit scope and duration of marital conflict and keep communication open for resolution of conflicts which arise.

2. Parent-Child Relationship

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
No affection is shown between parents and children. Great indifference or marked rejection of children. No respect shown for one another. No approval, recognition or encouragement shown to children. If any concern shown at all by parents, it takes the form of rank discrimination in favor of a few against the rest. Parent-Child conflict extremely	Affection between parents and children is intermittent, or weak, or obscured by conflict. Parents' anger unpredictable and unrelated to specific conduct of children. Family members played off against each other. Marked favoritism with no attempt to compensate disadvantaged children. Little mutual respect or concern for each other. Parents and	Affection is shown between parents and children. Parents try always to be consistent in treatment of children. Children have sense of belonging, emotional security. Children and parents show respect for each other, mutual concern. Parent-child conflict is minimal or restricted by consistent attention, free communication, and desire for harmony.

Appendix H (continued)

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
severe. (Above so serious as to constitute neglect as legally defined, and warrant intervention by authorities.)	children frequently in conflict. (Above present, but danger to children is potential - not actual.)	

3. Relationship Among Children

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Conflict between children resulting in physical violence or cruelty which warrants intervention.	Emotional ties among children are weak. Rarely play together. Fighting occurs often, teasing, bullying, other emotional or physical cruelty. Children rarely share playthings, show little loyalty to one another or pride in other's achievements.	Positive emotional ties and mutual identification among children. Depending on age, often play together, share their playthings. Loyal to each other, enjoy other's company, take pride in achievements of their siblings. Fighting and bickering normal for age.

4. Family Solidarity

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Marked lack of affection and emotional ties among family members. Conflict among members persistent or severe.	Little emotional warmth is evidenced among family members. Family members often in conflict.	Warmth and affection are shown among family members, giving them a sense of belonging and emotional security. Conflict within family dealt with quickly and appropriately.
Marked lack of cohesiveness and mutual concern, satisfactions in family living not evident. No pride in family or sense of family identity. Members plan on basis personal gratification rather than family as whole. Serious danger of family disruption. (Above so serious	Little cohesiveness, such as members rarely doing things together, eating together; little planning toward common family goals; little feeling of collective responsibility; little pulling together in crisis. Few satisfactions in family living. (Above presents potential but not yet	Definite evidence of cohesiveness: e.g., members often do things together; eat together; family plans and works toward some common goals; definite feeling of collective responsibility; members pull together in times of stress. Members find considerable satisfaction in family living.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
that laws relating to neglect or cruelty violated or family welfare so threatened that intervention justified.)	actual danger to welfare of children.) Family's solidarity assumes antisocial forms.	Cohesiveness not at odds with the welfare of the community.

B. Individual Behavior and Adjustment

1. Individual Behavior of Parents

Check separately for mother and father. Check "not applicable" if parent has no tie to family (as indicated under marital relationship). If there are more than one mother or father figures with ties to family, check the one who has the strongest tie with the family. Check "inadequate" if consequences of law violations (incarceration, probation, etc.) are still operative; however, prolonged probation should be weighed with other factors.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Socially Delinquent Behavior:	Socially Delinquent Behavior:	Socially Delinquent Behavior:
Is incarcerated or on probation for law violation. Seriously deviant sexual behavior (promiscuity, etc.) or serious offenses against family (assault, incest, etc.) endangering welfare of children. Excessive drinking severely affecting family welfare (reducing budget below minimal level, causing severe conflict, etc,(and warranting intervention for sake of children.)	Minor law violations not resulting in incarceration or probation, deviant sexual conduct, offenses against family, or excessive drinking, but not seriously affecting family welfare. Deficiency in social skills which handicaps comfortable relationships to people and institutions.	Law violations are limited to such slight infractions as minor traffic violations. Drinking or extramarital relations not a serious problem to individual or to family. Has fair complement of social skills, relates comfortably to most people and institutions.
Mental-Physical State:	Mental-Physical State:	Mental-Physical State:
Serious mental illness requiring intervention or resulting in institutionalization.	Mental or emotional disorder is present but able to function on minimal level, not actually dangerous to family.	Mental health is good. Psychosocial functioning at the level of individual's potential.
Mental defectiveness requiring institutionalization or so limiting capacity to maintain family life that special help or training necessary.	Mental retardation seriously limiting functioning.	Performs up to mental capacity and able to function adequately in most areas.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Parent has disease which endangers public health, has not sought or carried through on treatment, health authorities have right to intervene, chronic or major physical disease or handicap so disabling that person unable to provide the minimum care for children who are his major responsibility.	Chronic or major physical disease or handicap which is somewhat disabling, but permits minimal functioning especially in regard to care of children.	Diseases or handicaps not of serious nature, receiving appropriate treatment, functioning hampered only slightly if at all.
Role Performance[1]	Role Performance[1]	Role Performance[1]
As Spouse: If deserted or separated, does not support when so ordered. Extramarital liaisons endangering family. Severe conflict with spouse damaging to children.	As Spouse: Frequent conflict or disagreement with spouse in many areas of living, emotional tie weak.	As Spouse: Conflict with spouse is minimal, dealt with appropriately; extramarital affairs rare, positive emotional tie, disagreements well handled or well tolerated.
As Parent: Violation of laws relating to neglect of children, assault, incest, etc., making intervention necessary.	As Parent: Little concern for or interest in children. Displays little affection for them, physical and emotional care provided minimal. Shows favoritism.	As Parent: Positive relationship with children, shows them affection, spends time with them, provides appropriate physical and emotional care.
As Breadwinner: If absent, does not support when so ordered. If at home, and physically able to work, is unable or unwilling to support family.	As Breadwinner: Provides marginal or uncertain income, but little or no PA required. (Unless so disabled as to require outside support.)	As Breadwinner: Provides income for family enabling above-minimal living standard. Works regularly at full-time job, has positive feeling for job.

[1]Due allowance should be made for variations in parental roles made necessary by the particular family structure. Thus the mother's role as supplementary or chief wage earner needs to be considered where children do not have to be looked after during the day. The father's role as homemaker may have to be reviewed where he is unable to earn a living, etc.

Appendix H (continued)

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
As Homemaker: Housekeeping and care of children so inadequate that it constitutes neglect and warrants intervention.	As Homemaker: Housekeeping and care of children poor, but health of family not seriously endangered.	As Homemaker: Housekeeping and care of children is generally good.
As Member of Community: Law violations other than offenses against family. Extremely hostile attitude toward community - children encouraged to commit antisocial acts.	As Member of Community: Has little or no social contacts with neighbors, relatives, etc., belongs to no social groups, is dissatisfied with social status. Has a generally hostile attitude toward community, makes poor use of resources.	As Member of Community: Has meaningful ties with friends, relatives, etc. Belongs to some social groups which provide satisfactions, is comfortable with social status, with or without some desire to improve it. Has positive attitude toward community, makes good use of facilities when necessary.

2. Individual Behavior and Adjustment of Children

For purposes of scoring, children 10 and over are considered together, as are children from 1 to 9. The total score for each group is determined by finding the average of separate scores. Do not consider children who are permanently out of home.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Acting Out Behavior: Acting out, disruptive, antisocial behavior of serious concern and indicative of a child in real danger, warranting intervention. Incarcerated or on probation.	Acting Out Behavior: Acting out, disruptive, antisocial behavior of less serious nature, not a long-standing pattern, not indicative of more serious problems, therefore intervention not warranted.	Acting Out Behavior: Acting out behavior is normal for age - pranks, mischievousness, etc., not of serious nature.
Mental-Physical State: Mental illness requiring intervention or resulting in hospitalization. Excessively withdrawn or other behavior suggesting emotional disturbance or serious problems in relating to others.	Mental-Physical State: Emotional disorder evident, but receiving treatment or not serious enough to justify intervention.	Mental-Physical State: Emotional health appears good, enjoys appropriate activities, relates well to others.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Mental defectiveness requiring institutional training or custodial care that is not provided.	Performance below mental and/or physical capacity. Mental retardation severely limiting functioning, but special training, such as special class received.	Performs up to mental and physical capacity and able to function adequately in most areas.
Child has disease which endangers public health, no measures taken for isolation or treatment. Other serious health conditions or handicaps for which proper care is not provided.	Child not retarded, but performs well below capacity. Presence of chronic or major physical disease or handicap receiving some treatment, but permits minimal functioning.	Diseases or handicaps if present are receiving appropriate care with resulting favorable adjustment.
Role Performance	Role Performance	Role Performance
As Child: Violent destructive, or assaultive behavior against family members.	As Child: Gets along poorly with parents and siblings, rarely performs household duties.	As Child: Close ties to family members. Continuous participation in household duties and family life.
As Pupil: Excessive truancy, disruptiveness, incorrigibility, property destruction causing intervention. Other infringements of school regulations resulting in suspension, expulsion, etc.	As Pupil: Acting out or withdrawn behavior of less serious nature. Attendance not regular but no action taken. School work poor. Little positive feeling toward school.	As Pupil: Attends regularly, school work approximates ability, positive attitude toward school. Acting out limited to occasional pranks.
As Member of Peer Groups: Participation with others in delinquent acts. So unable to relate to peers as to be severely disturbed emotionally. Often involved in severe conflicts with peers.	As Member of Peer Groups: Has few friends, belongs to no peer groups, conflict with peers	As Member of Peer Groups: Is well liked, has friends, belongs to one or more peer groups.

C. Care and Training of Children

1. Physical Care

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Supply and care of clothes, cleanliness, diet, and health care	Children have few clothes, which are dirty and not mended,	Children have suitable clothes, are kept clean, diet well

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
provided for children seriously endangers their health or threatens adjustment in school and acceptance in peer groups. Vermin a serious health or social handicap. (Above so serious that intervention warranted.)	pay little attention to cleanliness, receive unbalanced, unnutritious diet. Parents lax in looking after health needs of children, but health of children and social adjustment are not threatened to the extent that intervention is justified.	balanced and wholesome, health needs are looked after promptly.

2. Training Methods and Emotional Care

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Affection is rarely shown to children, marked indifference or obvious rejection. Parents have pathological tie to children, use them as pawns. Physical and emotional cruelty. (Above so serious that intervention is warranted.)	Little affection is shown to children, parents usually indifferent to or reject children, or are overpermissive. Children have little sense of emotional security. (Above potential rather than actual danger to children.)	Parents show steady affection for children, provide atmosphere of emotional warmth, sense of belonging.
Parents' behavior standards are so deviant from wider community that children are encouraged toward antisocial acts.	Parents' behavior standards in many respects somewhat deviant from community, or there is a lack of standards, or parents expect too much or too little maturity.	Parents' ideas of how children should behave are generally those acceptable to community. Standards of behavior are appropriate to age level.
Physical punishment overly severe, or inappropriate. Extreme lack of discipline. Inconsistency of methods in one parent or between parents, limits not enforced, strong disagreement between parents on training. Approval shown rarely or not at all. (Above directly contributes to delinquent behavior or otherwise puts children in danger.)	Parents are overly rigid, overpermissive, indifferent. Physical punishment, swearing occurs. Discipline not appropriate to behavior. Approval of good conduct rare. Parents are inconsistent, often do not enforce limits, disagree with each other over exercise of discipline, do not share task of training. Parents show favoritism. (Above potential rather than actual danger.)	Parents are neither overly rigid nor overly permissive, physical punishment rare. Method used usually appropriate to behavior. Approval of good conduct often shown. Parents are fairly consistent in exercising discipline, enforce limits set, agree with each other in exercising discipline, share job of training children.

Appendix H (continued)

D. Social Activities

1. Informal Associations

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Conflict with relatives, neighbors, friends resulting in physical violence or illegal activities. Persons as above such a disturbing and discordant influence on family as to endanger welfare of children. Participation with friends in perpetrating delinquent antisocial acts.	Broken, discordant, indifferent relationships to relatives. Frequent squabbles with neighbors. Family members have few or no social outlets with friends or have friends whose influence leads to dubious social consequences (drunken sprees, destruction of property, children left alone, etc.)	Majority of relationships with relatives are pleasant and satisfying. Fairly amicable relationships maintained with neighbors. Family members have social outlets with friends providing recreational and interpersonal satisfactions, sense of identification with larger groups, provide necessary socialization experiences for children.

2. Formal Associations

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Membership in formal groups perpetrating antisocial acts. Behavior in organized group so destructive or disruptive that intervention is necessary.	Family members belong to no organized groups. No activity with groups having a civic orientation. Family feels socially rejected and unable to improve social status.	Family members, where appropriate, belong to some clubs, organizations, unions, etc. Some members active in groups which lend support to community betterment.

E. Economic Practices

1. Source and Amount of Income

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Income entirely from general relief because of failure of able-bodied head of household to support (except temporary layoffs, and ADC or other payments due to absence of husband or his disability). Income from PA obtained through fraudulent means. Income derived from theft, forgery, etc.	Income derived partly from general relief because head of household unable to hold a steady job or laid off because of employment situation, unless disabled, because of physical handicap, mental illness or deficiency. Children of working age who are not in school, service, etc., are not working.	Income derived from work of family members, or from sources such as pensions, rent, support payments, etc., but money is not from public funds (except for pensions, A.D.C., A.B., O.A.A., etc.)

Appendix H (continued)

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Amount of income so low or unstable that basic necessities not provided for children.	Amount of income marginal or unstable, barely meets family needs.	Family sufficiently independent financially to afford a few luxuries or savings, is fairly well satisfied with economic status, and working toward greater financial security.

2. Job Situation

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Behavior on job breaks the law, as fraud, embezzlement, robbery, physical violence to coworkers. Able-bodied man unwilling to obtain employment	Frequent changes of job, unsteady work pattern, works less than full time, job is below capacity. Poor relations with boss and coworkers, dissatisfied with job.	Works regularly at full-time job, seeks advancement, changes jobs only when unavoidable due to economic or other circumstances, or for improvement. Job is suitable for person's capabilities, maintains harmonious relations with boss and coworkers, has positive feeling toward job.

3. Use of Money

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Severe conflict over control of income endangering children's welfare. Budgeting and money management so poor that basic necessities not provided. Excessive debt resulting in garnishment, or reduces family budget as above.	Disagreement over control of income leading to conflict among family members. Family unable to live within budget, money management poor, luxuries take precedence over basic necessities, impulsive spending. (Above not seriously endangering children's welfare.)	Money spent on basis of agreement that such is responsibility of one or more members of family. Family budgets income, money management carried out with realistic regard to basic necessities. Debts are relatively few, and seldom incurred for luxuries; they are manageable and planned for in the budget.

Note: Above applies only to family members contributing substantially to support of family.

F. Household Practices

1. Physical Facilities

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Property is so deteriorated, kept in such poor state of repair, facilities for sleeping, washing, sanitation, heat, water, refrigeration, or cooking so inadequate as to be an actual threat to the physical and emotional welfare of family members, particularly children; situation necessitates intervention by health or other authorities.	Property is deteriorated, in poor state of repair, sufficient space not available. Absence or inadequacy of basic household equipment. (Above potentially harmful to welfare of children.)	Property is kept in good condition, sufficient space for family members. Necessary household equipment available and in good working order.

2. Housekeeping Standards

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Home is maintained in such a dirty and unsanitary condition, meals so irregular, diet so inadequate as to constitute an actual hazard to physical well-being of children. Vermin or rats present serious health hazard.	Home is in disorder, meals irregular, diet poorly planned, making a potential hazard to physical welfare of children.	Home is maintained in a condition conducive to good health, hygiene, and a sense of orderliness. Meals served regularly, diet is well balanced and nutritious. Attention paid to making home attractive.

G. Health Conditions and Practices

1. Health Problems

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Presence of communicable disease endangering public health, not isolated or properly treated. Major or chronic disease or handicap so severely limiting person's functioning within and without the home that there is an actual threat to family welfare, particularly the care children are receiving.	Presence of disease, major chronic illness or handicaps which limits person's functioning inside and outside home, but constitutes no actual threat to family welfare.	Physical health of family members is such that they are able to function adequately in their various roles.

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Proper treatment or quarantine not secured for diseases endangering life of person and/or public health. Parents neglect or refuse to provide medical or other remedial care for health and well-being of children. Disease prevention practices (sanitation, diet, etc.) not followed. Conditions so poor that physical neglect of children is involved.	Refusal or failure to get or continue medical care other than in column to left. Medical instructions disregarded or not followed consistently. Disease prevention practices not generally followed, but health of children not seriously endangered.	Concern is shown about ill health or handicaps, medical care promptly sought when needed, medical instruction followed. Disease prevention practices are observed.

H. Relationship to Family Centered Worker

1. Attitude Toward Worker

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Physical violence or verbal assault and other types of insulting behavior.	Worker met with hostility, resentment, or defensiveness on part of family; or marked indifference shown.	Worker is received with friendliness and readiness to consider family problems in relation to services offered.

2. Use of Worker

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Refusal to talk with worker when the basis of community concern is such that the worker has a right to stay in the situation. Absolute refusal to acknowledge any problems.	Apathy apparent in dealing with caseworker. Reluctance shown to recognize and/or deal with major family problems.	Willingness is shown to work together with worker on major problems facing the family. Awareness shown of the major problems upon which casework has been concentrating and effort made to work toward solution of problem.

Appendix H (continued)

I. Use of Community Resources

1. School

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Parents are extremely hostile to school, encourage or abet consistent truancy, are antagonistic to school personnel; refuse cooperation when this is necessary due to seriousness of community concern.	Parents place little value on education, take little interest in children's school activities, are lax in enforcing attendance, are uncooperative with school in plans for children.	Parents value education for their children, see that they attend school regularly, are cooperative with school personnel when joint planning is indicated.
Children have extremely negative attitude toward school, are excessively truant without excuse, are very disruptive, destroy school property, commit other infringements of school regulations demanding intervention.	Children have negative attitude toward school, truant rather frequently, are disruptive or a disturbing influence; do poor school work, but not sufficiently serious to warrant intervention.	Children like school, attend regularly, are not behavior problems, achieve according to capacity.

2. Church

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Law violations directed against church, as robbery, destruction of property, committing nuisances, vandalism, etc. Instilling hostile attitudes in children toward religion. Serious religious conflict between parents has negative effect upon children.	Using church for purposes sharply at variance with aims of church, as being an extremely disruptive influence in a church group. Children are permitted to attend Sunday School or church social activities, but parents oppose or show negative attitudes toward church.	Attend church fairly regularly, derive personal satisfaction from church tie.

Note: Check under "Marginal" and "Adequate" only if family member(s) are <u>active</u> members of a church or church group. If there are no church ties, or only nominal church membership, check "not appropriate." "Inadequate" applies whether or not there are church ties.

3. Health Resources
(including mental health)

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Hostility or bitterness or apathy toward available health resources so great that serious health problems of children do not receive medical care, or health needs of parents that prevent them from caring for children are not met.	Family regards health resources with suspicion, hostility, resentment. Agencies used unconstructively, appointments are missed, follow-through lacking, medical advice not followed, but not to extent of seriously endangering children's welfare.	Family has positive attitude toward health agencies, available facilities are used promptly when need arises, appointments are kept, medical advice followed.

4. Social Agencies
(includes probation, housing authority, employment agencies, etc. as well as casework agencies.)

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Extreme hostility to social agencies leading to behavior such as assault, robbery, or destruction of property, fraud, etc. Refusal to accept agency services where this has been ordered by law or is necessary because of community concern about children.	Attitude toward agencies marked by hostility, resentment, defensiveness, apathy, etc. Agencies used unconstructively - family is not cooperative, or is apathetic, or overly demanding, etc.	Attitude toward agencies is positive. Family utilizes agencies appropriately for improvement of family life or for meeting needs of individual members. Show cooperation in working on joint plans.

5. Recreational Agencies

Inadequate	Marginal	Adequate
Hostility toward recreational agencies leads to assault, robbery, destruction of property, etc. Parents prevent children from using organized recreational facilities.	Children seldom use organized recreational groups - such as playgrounds. If use is made, behavior is characterized by disruptiveness, noncooperation, etc.	Family members, particularly children, make use of available recreational resources according to age and interest which provide satisfaction and necessary socialization experience (for children).